Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

APPENDIX.

I. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION, NEW HAVEN, 1885.

II. TREASURER'S REPORT (p. xxx).

III. LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS (p. liii).

IV. CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION (p. lxiv).

V. PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION (p. lxvi).

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION.

Cyrus Adler, Philadelphia, Penn.
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Conn.
John Avery, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
I. T. Beckwith, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
George Bendelari, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Louis Bevier, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Sylvester Burnham, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
John M. Cross, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Francis B. Denio, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.
Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Mrs. G. W. Field, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Isaac Flagg, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
O. O. Fletcher, Ottawa, Ill.
Farley B. Goddard, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Thomas D. Goodell, Hartford, Conn.
William W. Goodwin, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
William Gardner Hale, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Isaac H. Hall, New York, N. Y.
Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
William R. Harper, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
James A. Harrison, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
W. T. Hewett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Edmund Morris Hyde, Cheshire, Conn.
Charles R. Lanman, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
T. R. Lounsbury, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn.
David G. Lyon, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.
Winfred R. Martin, Hartford, Conn.
George B. McKibben, Denison University, Granville, O.
Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
C. K. Nelson, Brookeville, Md.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.
Albert H. Palmer, Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio.
Tracy Peck, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio.

Samuel B. Platner, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
Samuel Porter, National Deaf Mute College, Washington, D. C.
L. S. Potwin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
George Prentice, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
C. W. Reid, Allegheny College, Meadville, Penn.
Rufus B. Richardson, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.
C. P. G. Scott, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Thomas D. Seymour, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
E. G. Sihler, New York, N. Y.
Frank B. Tarbell, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Ambrose Tighe, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
James A. Towle, Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.
Addison VanName, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
William Hayes Ward, New York, N. Y.
Benjamin W. Wells, Providence, R. I.
J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Standfordville, N. Y.
A. S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn.
William Dwight Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Henry P. Wright, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
John Henry Wright, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

[Total, 64.]

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., Tuesday, July 7, 1885.

THE Seventeenth Annual Session was called to order at 3.15 P. M., in Sloane Laboratory, Yale College, by the President of the Association, Professor William W. Goodwin, of Harvard College.

The Secretary, Professor John H. Wright, of Dartmouth College, presented the following report of the Executive Committee: —

a. The Committee had elected as members of the Association:[1]

George Gillespie Allen, Boston, Mass.
Sidney G. Ashmore, Professor of Latin, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
Francis Brown, Professor of Biblical Philology, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
Sylvester Burnham. Professor in Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Adolphe Cohn, Professor of French, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry A. Coit, D. D., St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
John M. Cross, Ph. D., Lawrenceville, N. J.
John M. Comstock, Chelsea, Vt.
W. S. Currell, Professor in Hampden-Sidney College, Va.
Miss C. T. Davis, Teacher of Latin, Packer Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Francis B. Denio, Professor in Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.
Morton W. Easton, Professor of Comparative Philology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
Charles E. Fay, Professor of Modern Languages, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass.
O. O. Fletcher, Ottawa, Ill.
Kuno Francke, Instructor in German, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Harold N. Fowler, Ph. D., Instructor in Greek, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry C. Johnson, Professor of Latin, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Penn.
David G. Lyon, Professor of Divinity, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Miss Ellen F. Mason, Newport, R. I.
George F. McKibben, Professor in Denison University, Granville, O.
Charles R. Miller, Editor of *The New York Times*, New York, N. Y.

[1] In this list are included the names of all persons elected at the Seventeenth Session of the Association.

George E. Moore, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
Rev. Alfred B. Nichols, Tutor in German, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Marston Niles, 155 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Albert H. Palmer, Professor of German, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
George Herbert Palmer, Professor of Philosophy, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
John P. Peters, Professor in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia, Penn.
W. H. P. Phyfe, 12 East 43d Street, New York, N. Y.
William T. Piper, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.
Samuel B. Platner, Ph. D., Instructor in Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
John W. Redd, Professor of Greek, Centre College, Danville, Ky.
Charles F. Richardson, Professor of English, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Samuel G. Sanders, Professor of Greek, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.
C. C. Shackford, Professor in Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Robert Sharp, Professor of Greek, University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
E. G. Shumway, Professor of Latin, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
Josiah R. Smith, Professor of Greek, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
Louis D. Ray, Wilson and Kellogg's School, New York, N. Y.
F. E. Rockwood, Professor in the University at Lewisburg, Penn.
J. R. S. Sterrett, Ph. D., Athens, Greece.
E. T. Tomlinson, Rutgers Grammar School, New Brunswick, N. J.
William Hayes Ward, D. D., Editor of *The Independent*, New York, N. Y.
Benjamin B. Warfield, Professor of New Testament Greek, Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Penn.
William E. Waters, Tutor in Latin, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
D. M. Welton, Professor of Hebrew, McAllister Hall, Toronto, Canada.
James R. Wheeler, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.

[Total, 46.]

b. The Proceedings for the Session of July, 1883, were published in November, 1884. The Transactions for the same year (Vol. XIV.) were published in October, 1884. The Proceedings for the Session of July, 1884, were published on January 22, 1885, and the Transactions for the same year (Vol. XV.) were published on the day of making the report (July 7, 1885).

On motion, Professor George Bendelari, of Yale College, was appointed Assistant Secretary for the session.

At 3.45 P. M., the reading of communications was begun. At this time there were about sixty persons in the room; at subsequent meetings the number of those present averaged seventy.

1. Quantity in English Verse, by Thomas D. Goodell, Ph. D., of the Public High School, Hartford, Conn.

It is evident that every syllable occupies in pronunciation a definite amount of time, — definite in any given case, however that amount of time may vary for

the same syllable in different circumstances. In any series of words naturally pronounced, — e.g. "I come from haunts of coot and hern," — the relative time occupied by the voice in speaking each syllable is capable of measurement. The time thus given to each syllable is its "quantity." The subject of investigation in the paper was the "quantities" (in this sense of the word) actually appearing in modern English poetry as commonly and naturally read aloud.

The rhythm of Greek verse consisted in "a definite arrangement of times," *χρόνων τάξις ἀφωρισμένη*. That is, the voice marked off the flow of syllables into little groups by an increase of stress in the enunciation of at least one syllable of each group. This ictus recurred at approximately equal intervals of time, so that in a given line the separate syllabic groups, or feet, were as nearly equal in time as the measures in modern music. Further, the relative quantities of the syllables constituting each foot were such that, as in modern music the measures, so in Greek verse the feet contained, for example, some three, others four units of time. The two factors of rhythm in Greek verse were thus quantity and stress.

All this is equally true of English verse, and in so far English verse is quantitative. Of course English verse is, in a certain sense, based on word-accent. The only essential element of English word-accent is stress; change of pitch may or may not be present without affecting the accentuation of a word; but whatever syllable has the stress has an accent, and where stress is not, there is no accent in English. And, for the most part, the place of the primary accent of English words is fixed. In constructing a line of verse, therefore, enough of the ictuses of the line must be made to coincide with primary accents to enable the reader to locate the other ictuses without effort. So far English verse is based on word-accent. But stress is only one element of rhythm. The other element, quantity, is just as essential in English verse as it is in music. The rhythmical character of a foot depends on the relative times of the syllables constituting the foot, precisely as in Greek verse, and precisely as in modern music. The late Sidney Lanier, in his volume on "The Science of English Verse" (New York, 1880), was apparently the first to point out the full significance of this fact; but owing to his faulty method of presenting the subject, and also to the intermingling of not a few errors, many readers have been so repelled as quite to overlook his valuable kernel of truth.

In illustration and proof of the above statements, passages of familiar English poetry were read, and their quantities indicated. It was shown that all varieties of Greek feet of four and of three times are common in English; while some combinations are frequent in English which were either rare or unknown in Greek.

Finally, an endeavor was made to state some of the laws governing the quantity of English syllables in connected discourse.

Remarks upon the paper were made by Professors W. D. Whitney, F. A. March, W. W. Goodwin, and in reply by Dr. Goodell.

Professor Whitney said: —

To claim quantity as an element in English measure is tautological, since measure is quantity. It amounts only to claiming that English verse is indeed measure, and not, like French verse, merely enumeration. If the successive ictuses did not follow one another at sensibly equal intervals in our verse, there

would be no measure, and hence, to our sense, no verse. But whereas in Greek (taking that language as an example) each syllable had its own independent quantity, as long or short, and these quantities, fitted together, determined the measure of the verse, the measure of English verse is determined only by accent, and the quantities of syllables are determined by the measure being made longer or shorter (by prolongation and abbreviation of the pronounced elements — especially, of course, the vowels — and by management of pauses) as the measure requires. Hence, measure being postulated as a common fundamental element, the method of its establishment in Greek and English respectively has all the difference ever claimed for it, — all, in fact, that one can well conceive; and Lanier's attempt to explain away this difference is a failure.

Professor March said: —

The common notation of English prosody exhibits the line as made up of equal times (feet), and the foot as made up of an arsis and thesis, the arsis being an accented syllabl, the thesis unaccented syllabls and rests. The way in which the time of each foot is divided between the syllabls and rests is commonly not indicated. But it might be, of course; and it often has been.

Many school grammars stil mark the syllabls as long and short, holding the ictus to lengthn its syllabl if otherwise short, and the thesis to shortn. This makes the English line similar in sound to a Latin or Greek line. But it does not accurately represent the facts. There is a striking difference between an English verse and a Greek one regarded merely as a succession of sounds; the ictus, the arsis of the foot, is the long syllabl in Greek, but in English freely the short one. Imagin an Athenian actor undertaking to recite an iambic line with the ictus on the short syllabls!

A considerabl number of English prosodists, who hav recognized the varying lengths of the syllabls in arsis and thesis, hav undertakn to represent the lengths which ought to be givn to each syllabl in selected passages of English poetry, using the common musical notation.[1] They hav not accomplisht much as yet; they hav indeed hardly attempted more than to giv elocutionists directions for tasteful reading. But it seems to me that there is an interesting field here for further study, as suggested by the paper.

It is possibl that there ar certain accented syllabls so short that they ar never combined with a short unaccented syllabl to make a foot; or certain unaccented syllabls so long that they ar never put with long accented syllabls. This can be ascertaind by an examination of all the feet in Milton, Shakespeare, and the rest, as Sievers has just examind Béowulf.

If no such syllabls ar found, it is stil likely that there may be some as to which a large majority of the feet indicate one quantity or the other, and show that certain combinations ar preferd for the happiest verse.

[1] Joshua Steele, Prosodia Rationalis, London, 1775. Richard Roe, English Metre, London, 1801. J. Odell, Essay on the Elements, Accents, and Prosody of the English Language, for Supplement to Johnson's Dict., London, 1806. John Thelwall, Illustrations of English Rhythmus, London, 1812. He contributed articls on this subject to Rees' New Encyclopaedia. He holds that the English rhythmus is one of mezure; we hav all the feet of the classic languages, and more; all feet ar mezured from the ictus. He uses musical notation of length, common and tripl time; lays foundations for everything in fysiological facts. Sidney Lanier, The Science of English Verse, New York, 1880.

Or if not in all the poets, yet in some singl poet it may appear that they ar pronounct in such and such ways. It is likely that personal preferences for such and such combinations may be establisht from the poetry of Milton and Shakepeare and Tennyson.

The expressivness and harmony of such and such combinations may also be establisht by induction.

The study of these personal elements, and of rules of expression and harmony, is as valuabl perhaps as that of the essential laws of verse.

Notations of readings such as hav been givn in the paper just red, in Lanier, Thelwall, and the rest, ar interesting, and would be more so if recorded by fonograf; if accumulated, they might rise to scientific value.

Rules such as ar givn in the paper for adjusting the prose quantities to the mezure of a verse ar valuabl. The fundamental rule which was generalized in the classic poetry of Greece and Rome is to keep your ictus long, your thesis short, as far as may be. Rules for more delicate adjustment ar as yet in the realm of taste. See "Harmonies of Verse," Proceedings of this Association for 1883, pp. xi, xii.

Our scholar poets ar now often trying their skil in making verses exactly like those of Latin and Greek poetry, as other poets occasionally hav done since Spenser. They may use rules of taste in reading as rules for construction of the poetry of the future.

2. Equestrianism in the Doloneia, by Professor B. Perrin, of Adelbert College, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

In the Homeric poems the horse is driven to the war chariot in a manner purely Oriental. There is no fighting on horseback. Ordinary riding is not even mentioned, either in peace or war. Instances of professional riding or performing on horseback are O 679 ff., and ε 370 ff., both in similes which probably involve features of the poet's own period. The only other place in Homer where riding is mentioned at all, and the only one where a hero is represented as riding, is in the Doloneia, vv. 469 ff. That Diomedes at least, if not Odysseus also, is made to ride the horses of Rhesus back to the Greek camp, has been the almost unanimous view of commentators. But the last edition of Liddell and Scott, *s. v.* ἵππος, adds to previous material this parenthesis: "For a careful reading of the whole passage shows that Diomed and Ulysses were *driving the chariot* of Rhesus, not *riding his horses*."

In persuading the Greek heroes to attack the Thrakians, Dolon dwells about equally on the horses, chariot, and armor of Rhesos. Of the armor no further mention is made, except that it lay on the chariot (v. 504). To the chariot certain reference is made in vv. 475, 501, and 504 f. In the first passage the horses are described as haltered to the railing of the chariot box. In the second, Odysseus is said to have forgotten to take the goad from the chariot when he untied the horses from it. In the last, Diomedes thinks of stealing the chariot by dragging or carrying it away. Here only does the poet represent Dolon's description of the splendor of the chariot as inflaming the cupidity of the Greeks. Their ambition was centred on the horses as the chief prize.

The only phrase of the poet which can lead one to think of the chariot as taken with the horses is the ἵππων ἐπεβήσετο of vv. 513 and 529. Everywhere else in Homer this phrase is used of mounting to the chariot behind the horses. It

was this consideration which led Welcker (Ep. Cyc., II., p. 217) first to dispute the inference of Wolf and others that the Doloneia afforded the solitary instance of actual riding in Homer. Welcker's view has been adopted by only two scholars (Anhang to the Ameis-Henze Iliad *ad loc.*), — Sickel, in an essay as yet inaccessible to the writer, and Döderlein, in his note on K 513. Aside from these, the scholiasts, Eustathius, and all commentators accessible to the writer interpret the passage as Wolf did (Proleg., p. 80).

Against this view of Welcker, thus unexpectedly restored to notice by Liddell and Scott, may be reproduced the arguments of Düntzer (Philol., XII., p. 54 f.), and one or two fresh arguments may be urged, suggested by a review of the episode.

1. For *ἵππων ἐπεβήσετο* = *he mounted the horses*, the original meaning of *ἵππων*, and the fact that this is the only place in Homer where mounting on horseback is described at all, so that the serio-comic return of the Greek heroes to their camp involves the poet in a description of that for which there was no well-established phraseology, justify the somewhat forcible appropriation of a stock phrase current in another sense than the exact one here needed.

2. The dilemma of Diomedes (503 ff.), was as to what rashest thing he could do, not whether he should continue or cease his rashness. The alternative of total opposition, like the second in the mind of Achilles, A 192, is presented to the mind of Diomedes by the signal of Odysseus for return. Athene then dissuades him, not from killing more Thrakians only, as Welcker puts it, but also and just as much from stealing the chariot.

3. The author of the Rhesus agrees with that of the Doloneia in having the horses stolen without the chariot. Cf. Rhesus, 616 ff., 780–798. In both passages *ὄχημα πωλικόν* refers to the horses alone.

Amid noticeable variations from the Doloneia and the Rhesus in Vergil (Aen. I. 469 ff., cf. Servius *ad loc.*), there is plain agreement in this, that the horses only are stolen. Ovid alone, in the speech of Ulysses for the armor of Achilles, where other familiar Homeric episodes, as well as other features of this, are freely distorted, thinks of the chariot of Rhesos as stolen (Met. XIII. 239 ff.).

Diomedes at least, then, rode one of the horses which Odysseus had hitched together. But both heroes are made to dismount at v. 541, although it is nowhere expressly stated that Odysseus mounted with Diomedes. The point in the narrative where this is to be understood is held by some commentatators to be v. 499, by others v. 513. No very conclusive arguments can be urged for either view. The paper endeavors to show that one moves along the line of least resistance by following Eustathius, and making Odysseus mount at v. 513, after Diomedes.

The Association adjourned to 8 P. M.

New Haven, Conn., Tuesday, July 7, 1885.

Evening Session.

One of the Vice-Presidents, Professor Tracy Peck, of Yale College, called the Association to order, at 8.15 P. M., in the Lecture-Room of Sloane Laboratory, where a large audience had gathered to listen to the address of the President.

The Secretary read the programme for the meeting of Wednesday.

On behalf of President Noah Porter, of Yale College, necessarily absent from town, Professor Peck invited the members of the Association and their friends to visit the Library, Battell Chapel, the Art Gallery, the Museums, and other collections of Yale College. He also extended an invitation to the Association to join in an excursion upon the Sound, on Wednesday afternoon, in the barge Juno.

3. The Annual Address, by Professor William W. Goodwin, of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., President of the Association.

The Address began with a brief review of the early history of the Association, with reminiscences of the first three meetings, of 1869, 1870, and 1871, and a tribute to the memory of Professors Hadley and Packard, which the second meeting in New Haven suggested.

After a short discussion of the scope of the science of Philology, to which the Association is devoted, the speaker passed to the chief subject of his address, — *the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*. From what was said on this topic the following extracts are made: —

"I wish to make an earnest appeal to the members of this Association, individually and collectively, in behalf of the boldest enterprise that has ever been undertaken by our countrymen to maintain the broad definition of classic Philology to which we are pledged. I mean the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Although this was not founded by our society, it is yet an institution which deserves the earnest support of every friend of sound learning, of every one who is eager to increase the depth and the breadth of American scholarship. The studies which it was established to encourage are those which lie at the very foundation of classic philology, as this science was understood by its greatest masters. It was a wise and far-sighted policy which led Germany more than fifty years ago to establish her Archaeological Institute in Rome; and it was a still wiser policy which led the Imperial government of Germany about ten years ago to give this body two permanent homes in classic lands, — one upon the Capitol of Rome, the other at the foot of the Acropolis of Athens. The German Institute found a French school at Athens, which had been working there since 1846; and the example of these successful institutions soon inspired English scholars to prepare to enter the same field. While our more cautious English brethren were planning and securing the means to establish themselves permanently at Athens, our own more impetuous scholars, with a zeal which has called forth surprise and admiration, saved the time which elaborate financial schemes would have cost us, and established our School at once, without capital, through the co-operation of twelve American colleges. These colleges agreed to supply us with a director each year from their body of professors, without expense, except for house-rent; and the friends of our enterprise at each college agreed to pay an annual contribution (generally $250) for a certain term of years, to meet the other expenses of the School, except when this sum was voted from the college treasury. We have thus a foundation which enables us now to enter upon our fourth year with an honorable record in the past and bright hopes for the future; but we must not conceal from our friends

or from ourselves that this is even now a precarious foundation, and one upon which we cannot safely rely for our future support.

"The object of the School at Athens is to afford American students the same advantages for studying in Greece itself the many lessons which the great mother of arts has still to teach them as are now enjoyed there by the students of Germany and France, and will soon be enjoyed by those of England. These advantages may seem sentimental and unsubstantial to those who have never known them; but no arguments are needed by any one who has once trodden the soil of Greece and breathed the air of Attica to convince him of their reality. The school will be equally beneficial to two classes of students, and a young man coming to Athens fresh from an American college may often doubt into which of these he will ultimately fall.

"It will afford the most ample facilities for those who wish to make a professional study of the monuments of Greek art and architecture which are preserved in such perfection at Athens, to study the vast collection of inscriptions which surround the visitor on every side as he enters the Acropolis, or to make topographical investigations in Athens or its neighborhood, of which there is still need in every direction. Let no one imagine that all the questions — even the *great* questions — which the architecture and the topography of Athens herself have to answer, have already been settled. The English architect Penrose is (or was recently) in Athens, making measurements for a revised edition of his great work on the Principles of Athenian Architecture. The whole question of the ancient roadway to the Acropolis which led to the Propylaea was still open when I left Athens two years ago; many important points in the original plan of the Propylaea itself are still under active discussion; and the western slope of the Acropolis still offers one of the most promising fields in or near Athens for archaeological discoveries. In 1882 Dr. Dörpfeld, the distinguished architect of the German School at Athens, caused much excitement among scholars by calling in question the common estimate of the Attic foot, on the ground of measurements made upon the Parthenon and the temple of Νίκη ἄπτερος. We do not yet know which of several hills is the famous citadel of Decelea, which the Spartans fortified in the last year of the Peloponnesian war; and the place of meeting of the public assembly of Athens, the renowned Pnyx, the deme of the great Attic Demos, is still a mystery to most scholars, — to none more than to those who most strongly reject the ancient remains now commonly known at Athens as the Pnyx and the Bema. The whole inner structure of the Erechtheum is a puzzle upon which no two scholars can agree. The so-called Theseum at Athens proudly keeps its famous name, and claims to be the original monument erected by the Athenians over the colossal skeleton which Cimon brought from Scyros in 468 B. C., on the very day when Sophocles first defeated Aeschylus in tragedy in the Dionysiac Theatre; while its identity is absolutely denied by most modern archaeologists, who at the same time are unable to agree on any satisfactory name for it. The question of the manner of lighting the Greek temples without side windows is still vigorously discussed; for, although some distinguished scholars confidently assert that the structure of the great temple of Zeus at Olympia settles the controversy decisively in favor of the hypaethral theory of an opening in the roof, others are equally convinced that this is an exploded notion. I mention these items merely as evidence that there is plenty of work, even on important and interesting subjects, still left for stu-

dents of Greek architecture and topography. If our School is ever supplied with the means of making independent archaeological explorations and excavations, as we must hope it will be, there is no limit to the new opportunities for original study which may suddenly be opened to the students. The French School sent its expedition to Delos many years ago; the German Institute was an important centre of exciting news while the exploration of Olympia was going on, and its present architect, Dr. Dörpfeld, was one of the chief directors of the excavations. The German Institute last year made important excavations and discoveries in and around the temple of Sunium. The Archaeological Society of Athens has disclosed a wealth of ancient temples in the sanctuary of Aesculapius, near Epidaurus, — among others, the beautiful round building erected by Polycletus, and the theatre, also the work of Polycletus; and the same society has now opened to the day the foundations and pavement of the great sanctuary of Eleusis, the home of the Eleusinian Mysteries, which offers more problems to architects and archaeologists than will soon be answered. Every part of Greece is full of plans for new excavations, which merely need money to be carried out with substantial results. The ruins of Delphi, with their countless buried temples, which peer imploringly from the scanty earth as if beseeching the traveller to restore them to the light of the sun, lie at this moment waiting only for some power to decide who shall excavate them, — the French, who are both willing and able to complete the work at their own expense, and ready to leave all that may be found to the Greeks, — or the Greeks themselves, who are equally willing, but are unable to meet the expenses of so great an undertaking. In the mean time, the people of the wretched village which covers these precious ruins with only a few feet of earth, have unfortunately become fully aware of the value of their sacred soil, and now demand about $100,000 for their houses and land, of which the government hesitates to dispossess them. But this dead-lock must soon be ended; and happy will be the scholars who are fortunate enough to be in Greece when the solemn silence of that wonderful valley of Delphi is first broken by the pickaxe and the spade.

"But although Athens and the rest of Greece offer such great and ever increasing attractions to special students of archaeology, the chief object of the School at Athens must always be to enlarge the scholarship of those who are to teach our youth in our own higher institutions of learning, by enabling them to complete their classical studies under all the inspiring associations of the real Athens. Such students will naturally add a year or more in Athens to a course of philological study in Germany or perhaps at home. Now, without entering upon any professional investigations in either architecture or archaeology, without undertaking excavations or making a special study of inscriptions or disputed points in antiquities, every classical student will find a large amount of work which he *must* do somewhere, and which he can do nowhere else so well as in Greece itself. There can be no better supplement to most of the philological studies of the German universities, and no better antidote for others, than a year or two spent in actual study in the countries and amid the very scenes with which the student's university life has been chiefly concerned. I hope it may be one of the chief functions of the School at Athens to complete and correct the strict training in scientific philology which students will receive from German universities or perhaps from our own, and thus to round off their scholarship and give it a practical turn, which will be its strongest safeguard against pedan-

try. A student will find a large range of classical subjects to which he can profitably devote a year in Greece. Every classical teacher should have a general acquaintance with at least the topography of Athens and Attica, and with the chief monuments of architecture and art in Athens. He should study the position of the three lines of wall by which Athens was connected with her harbors, and examine the massive remains of the fortifications with which Themistocles surrounded the Piraeus and Munychia. The account which Thucydides gives of the solid construction of these walls will be no longer a mere piece of ancient history to one who can make the circuit of the Piraeus; and the line of the southern Long Wall can be traced for perhaps half a mile from the hill of Munychia by scattered stones all pointing towards the Acropolis, while a cut in the railway discloses a section of this wall with several courses in place. The famous temples of the Acropolis and the other ruins of the city will impress themselves upon his mind and his future teaching almost without study: he cannot escape their influence if he will. Again, the whole literature of Greece is full of passages which can be fully appreciated only when they are read or remembered on the spot, in full view of the scenes which they describe. Where else than in Athens can the noble verses of the Attic poets, in which they celebrate their beautiful home, be so thoroughly understood? The historic scenes on which one looks down from Mount Pentelicus are far more vivid to the eye than years of study with books and maps can make them. We have here unfolded before us a map of Attica such as no Kiepert can draw for us: we see the beautiful bay and plain of Marathon lying almost at our feet; we try to follow the blue Euripus in its windings between the steep shores until the hills of Attica and of Euboea become inextricably blended; we look upon the sea from the bay of Eleusis and the coasts of Corinth and of Argolis to the islands beyond Sunium; and we see the great plain of Attica between Parnes and Hymettus, stretching to the Saronic Gulf and the Piraeus, with its central point of white where the marbles of the Acropolis flash in the sun. What place can equal Athens for studying the whole marvellous history of Attica? What a change is effected in every student's mind when first he can substitute the glorious panoramas which he beholds from the Attic hills, from Aegina, or from Salamis, for the maps which have hitherto represented these scenes to his mind!

"I shall never forget the sensation when Kiepert's map of Laconia suddenly vanished from my thoughts at the first sight of the valley of the Eurotas and Taÿgetus; nor when the puzzling topography of Boeotia cleared itself up as I saw it gradually unfolded from the citadel of Chaeronea, from the mighty fortress of the Minyan Orchomenos, and from Thespiae, Plataea, and the Cadmea of Thebes; nor when a black spot on the map was replaced by the snow-capped Parnassus himself, standing in all his dignity as sentinel over the great plain of Boeotia, the first sight that meets the traveller's eye when he enters the plain, and the last that vanishes as he passes into the hollows of Cithaeron on the road from Thebes to Athens.

"I have selected these points chiefly at random, to answer the question which is sometimes asked, What are our students expected to do in Athens? Every one will of course choose the subjects which he will study according to his tastes and his interest in literary, historical, topographical, or architectural questions. But no one will find any lack of subjects; and I am sure that neither

the student himself, nor the school or college in which he teaches on his return will ever have reason to regret the time that he spent in Greece."

"I wish to make a special appeal at this time in behalf of our School, because we are now at a crisis in our affairs when it is of the highest importance that we should at least begin the erection of a building in Athens during the coming year. The Greek government has most generously offered us a piece of land on the slope of Lycabettus, near the building of the French School, and adjoining the lot recently granted to the English School; and it behooves us to show that we are disposed to accept this liberal offer without further delay. It is a wretched policy for us to hire our present expensive quarters from year to year at a constantly increasing rent, while the land upon which we may now build a permanent home for the School is rapidly becoming occupied by new streets, and its price is as rapidly rising. If we reject the kind offer of the Greek government, or allow it to lapse by inaction, we shall never have an equally good opportunity to secure a house in Athens. If we accept it, we shall gain the dignity which will belong to γεωμόροι at Athens, and we shall save the annual rent of a piece of land valued at more than $10,000.

"When a similar offer was made to the committee of the British School, a large and enthusiastic meeting was at once held in London, under the presidency of the Bishop of Durham, at which it was unanimously voted to accept the land, and to use the £4,000 already subscribed for the School in erecting a house on Lycabettus; and Mr. Penrose, on his visit to Athens this year, was to make plans and begin work. At this meeting one of the strong motives urged for immediate action was the noble example of the American School, and the disgrace of allowing England to be behind us in this race. According to the report in *The Times*, —

"'The Bishop of Durham said that circumstances to which the report alluded had occurred since this scheme had first been mooted, which had very considerably altered their position. It now touched our honor as Englishmen very nearly that this scheme should be carried out without delay. France and Germany had long been in the field. France had her school, and Germany her institute, and now America likewise had forestalled us in this race. That new country, notwithstanding the vast and absorbing interests of the present, notwithstanding the boundless hopes of the future, had been eager to claim her part in the heritage. While all the civilized nations of the world, one after another, had established their literary councils at Athens, should England alone be unrepresented at the centre of Hellenic culture? It might have been expected that England would have been foremost in the field. In speaking of altered circumstances, he had not alluded only to the generous rivalry of America, which had outstripped us, but he had referred likewise to the important fact that the Greek government had offered a site for the School. This was a most generous act, and ought not long to remain unrecognized. It was of double value; not only was it a relief to their finances, but also an assurance and a pledge of a hearty welcome to them. We should indeed have occasion to hang our heads and blush for shame if it remained a day longer a dead letter. There was indeed every need for such an institution. . . . It was a great satisfaction to know that the universities were taking up the study of archaeology, making it part of their examination system, and so endeavoring to promote its spread. But what we wanted was to connect ourselves directly with the heart of Hellenic culture,

so that its very life-blood might flow through our veins, and this we should gain by the establishment of the School at Athens.'

"By a slight change these words will refer to our own present position. Can we, now that we have placed ourselves foremost in this race, consent to allow England to reach the goal before us, and to let our own example be used as a stimulus to urge her to outstrip us? Can we, after three years of honorable life in Athens, now consent to play the sleeping hare in the race with the tortoise? I feel sure that this will never be permitted when the urgent needs of our school are once known to the friends of learning in this country. We began our enterprise, as I have explained, in a peculiarly American way, — perhaps not very unlike the way in which some of our great Western railways are said to have been built, on the credit of bonds payable in the next century. We could not have begun it in any other way, at least for many years; and now that we have shown the necessity for the school, and the possibility of having one, we find it necessary to call on our friends to subscribe to our stock, that we may pay off our mortgage, as many a Western railway has done before us. We have followed the sage maxim of Aristotle, that 'whatever we have to learn to do, we learn by doing'; we learn to build a house by building a house; we learn to found a school by founding a school.

"For our full endowment we need a house in Athens, and also a permanent fund of $80,000 or $100,000, the income of which will pay a permanent director, supply the library with its annual needs, and defray the other expenses. Our School can never aspire to the rank which the French and German Schools now hold, unless it can keep a director in Athens who can aspire to be the peer of Foucart and Köhler; and it is not too much to say, that this can never be secured by sending a new man each year to take charge of the School. At the end of a year, our director will always feel that he has spent his whole time in preparation, and that he is just ready to begin his work in earnest; but he must then give place to his successor, who will repeat the same experience. But until we can secure our full endowment, we must be content to remain under this disadvantage, and to depend a few years longer upon the annual directors with whom the liberality of our supporting colleges supplies us. But we cannot safely postpone the more pressing call for a fixed home in Athens; and we cannot risk the combined danger of rejecting the offer of the Greek government, and of depending on our present annual subscriptions while we are paying rent for land which we might own without expense. For the house, furniture, and a fund for repairs and future enlargement, we need the same sum which the British School will invest in their proposed building, or $20,000. Of this amount about $4,000 has already been given us; and I again call on all who can either contribute themselves or induce others to contribute, to see that the remainder is provided in time for us to begin our building during the coming year. Will not some one friend of learning seize this rare opportunity to do a great service to letters, and connect his or her name imperishably with Athens, by erecting a house on Mount Lycabettus, which, by an inscription in classic Greek on Pentelic marble, shall testify this generosity to future generations of the many nations which visit that famous height?"

At the close of the Address, the Association adjourned to Wednesday, July 8, at 9 A.M.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., Wednesday, July 8, 1885.

MORNING SESSION.

The President called the Association to order, and the reading of communications was at once resumed, at 9.20 A. M.

4. The Tibeto-Burman Group of Languages, by Professor John Avery, of Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine.

The extensive group of related tongues which has been called by recent writers Tibeto-Burman lines the northern and eastern border of Hindustan, and stretches across Farther India into the westernmost provinces of China. Roughly speaking, this linguistic domain is bounded by 72° and 102° of east longitude, and by 10° and 35° of north latitude; so that geographically, and, as will appear, linguistically, the group lies midway between the principal isolating and agglutinative languages, and forms, so to speak, the step by which we ascend from the lower to the higher type of structure. It is, therefore, the relation of these languages to a general philosophy of human speech, and not their historical prominence, that entitles them to attentive study.

The scanty knowledge which we possess, as yet, of many of the tribes occupying this region, renders hazardous any attempt to fix precisely the limits of the group, or to name its subdivisions, except in a general way. We shall, therefore, in this abstract, follow a geographical order, noting in the fewest possible words the salient features of the most interesting languages or groups of associated dialects.

We begin with the Tibetan, whose standard, though most corrupted, dialect is spoken in the region of Lhassa; but which, in much variety of usage, encroaches on Chinese territory in the east, and overlaps Cashmere and the Panjab in the west. Literary culture came to Tibet from India in the seventh century A. D. The alphabet, derived from the same source, is syllabic, and has thirty characters, not including the subjoined vowel-signs. It represents some sounds not heard in *devanāgarī*, but has neither the cerebral row of mutes, nor the sonant aspirates. A striking peculiarity of Tibetan is its silent consonants, witnesses to a pronunciation which is bygone, save here and there in the dialects. To some extent, these letters serve the purpose of inflection. Case relations are denoted by added syllables, some of which retain their form and sense as independent words, and others have been degraded into servile particles. Adjectives, when they precede their substantive, take the genitive form, as abstract nouns of quality; but when they follow, assume the endings of declension, while the substantive is unchanged. The language has no possessive or relative pronoun, the genitive of the personal pronoun supplying the former, and a participle or independent sentence the latter. The verb is poor in forms, except participles and gerunds. It has neither person, number, nor voice; is always used impersonally, — what we call the subject being in an oblique case. Distinctions of tense are denoted by processes analogous to true inflection. The verb stands last in the sentence; postpositions take the place of prepositions; conjunctions are seldom used, on account of the preference for participial constructions; tones eke out scanty inflections, but do not form an important feature of the language.

Descending the southern slope of the great range, we come upon numerous small tribes, whose physical appearance and speech betray their relationship to the Tibetans, as well as to tribes more remote. They are found on the rugged slopes or the swampy lowlands from the Kali River, long. 80°, eastward beyond British India into Burma. On the uplands of Nepal are the Sunwar, Gurung, Magar, Murmi, Newar, Kiranti, and Limbu; lower down, the Bramhu, Kusunda, Chepang, and Vayu; next eastward, the Lepcha and Bhutanese. Only three of these tribes — the Newar, Limbu, and Lepcha — use alphabetic characters, and that to only a small degree. Though most of the languages of this region have a simple word-structure, bringing them near the level of the isolating tongues, the Kiranti and Vayu present a striking contrast. The personal pronouns have three numbers and a twofold form — exclusive and inclusive — for the first dual and plural. They likewise have distinct forms as they are used substantively or as suffixes. The verb has a remarkable development, for, though poor in tense-forms, it has a profusion of forms expressive of the relations of subject to object. Participles, too, vary according to the tense of the principal verb. Altogether, the possible forms of a Kiranti verb amount to several hundred. The existence of a language having so complex a structure in the midst of tongues equally marked for poverty of forms, presents an interesting ethnological and linguistic problem. The Lepcha has been greatly influenced by the Tibetan, from which it received its literary cultivation; but it has a distinct character of its own. Its words are mostly of one syllable; but derivation and composition are familiar features of the language, and examples of true inflexion are not wanting. The Bhutanese is merely a dialect of Tibetan. In the swampy region at the foot of the range are the Koch, the Bodo or Kachari, and the Dhimal tribes. The Koch language has nearly disappeared, and been replaced by corrupt Bengali. The Kachari and Dhimal closely resemble the Lepcha in type of structure. Following the range eastward, we find a succession of tribes whose languages, though not much studied yet, are believed to have a place in this group. The names are, in order of location, Akas, Dophlas, Miris, Abors, and Mishmis. On the eastern border of Assam are the Singphos, who under the name of Kakhyen extend across upper Burma into Yunan. On the southern border of Assam are the numerous Naga tribes, the Mikirs, and the Garos. The Garo is closely allied to the Kachari, which we found in Northern Bengal. It has the "exclusive and inclusive" forms of the first personal pronoun, as does the Kiranti; it has a negative conjugation of the verb; it employs infixes instead of prefixes or postfixes as modifiers of its verbs; it has no relative pronoun, except as one is sometimes borrowed from the Bengali. South of Assam are many languages and dialects of the same general type; but those belonging to the wilder tribes are scarcely well enough known to be classified with confidence. The most familiar names are the Manipuri, Khyeng, Kumi, Mru, Banjogi, Lushai, and Shendu. The position of the Karen dialects of British Burma is not yet settled, since they present features of both the isolating and agglutinative languages. The Burmese is the last name to be mentioned in this group, and has been too often described to need detailed examination. It resembles the Tibetan, not only in the kind and degree of its literary cultivation, but in many features of its structure. Its pronunciation has, like that of Tibetan, departed far from its written form. It has fewer silent consonants, but makes larger use of tones.

In place of further details, for which we have no space, the following compendious statements will give a general idea of the group as a whole.

1. The Tibeto-Burman alphabets want the Indian cerebrals and sonant aspirates, except so far as these have been introduced for writing foreign words, and in that case they lose their distinctive pronunciation. Both classes of sounds are found in the Santal, a Kolarian language of Central India, and in the Telugu, Canarese, and Malayalim of the Dravidian family. The Tamil has discarded aspirates.

2. These languages are not so dependent upon position to express the relations of the parts of a sentence as are the languages on their eastern border. Besides proper suffixes, prepositional words, derived from various parts of speech-mostly nouns, are much used, and regularly follow the words which they limit.

3. Pronouns have the same declension as nouns. A proper possessive pronoun has been developed from the genitive of the personal pronoun in a few instances, but ordinarily the simple genitive is made to suffice. So the Santal inflects the genitive of its personal pronoun, while its near kindred, the Kol, uses it without inflection. Inclusive and exclusive forms of the dual and plural of the first personal pronoun occur here, as in Central and Southern India. The absence of the relative pronoun, as an original possession, in these languages, is also a feature in which they coincide with Kolarian and Dravidian speech.

4. The distinction between verb and noun is not so clearly maintained as in the inflecting languages. Where we use a verb, these tongues oftener employ a verbal noun, with copula expressed, or more often understood, and agent in the instrumental case. In a majority of the languages the verb marks neither person nor number; a few do it in part, and the Kiranti alone wholly. Tense is generally denoted by suffixed syllables, which are more or less distinctly independent words, rarely by prefixes or a change of radical vowel. A negative conjugation, like that in the Dravidian verb, occurs in a few languages, but is not universal.

5. There is a customary order of words in the Tibeto-Burman sentence, but it admits of some variation. The verb stands last, and the subject at or near the beginning. The adjective commonly follows the substantive, taking the signs of declension; or may precede it, in which case it is treated as a noun of quality, in Tibetan having the genitive suffix. The last is the ordinary position of a limiting noun. The same rules of position are observed in the Kolarian and Dravidian languages, except that there the adjective precedes the substantive. The Chinese agrees with the Tibeto-Burman group in placing the limiting before the limited substantive, while the Mon-Anam languages of Indo-China reverse the order. In some other particulars the Tibeto-Burman and Mon-Anam groups agree as against the Chinese, from which it appears that the order of words in the sentence is not conclusive evidence of genetic relationship.

5. The Neo-Grammarians ("Junggrammatiker"), by Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.

This paper was in the form of comments on the articl on Philology by Professor E. Sievers in the ninth edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. He givs three characteristics of the neo-grammarians: —

1. They abandon glottogonic problems as insolubl.

2. They object to misleading metafors from organic development.

3. They hold that living languages ar the ones in which to obtain insight into the working forces of language.

As to the first and second, the old field and old method hav been workt long and hard. It is natural to turn to new fields and new methods; but in so far as there is an implication in the form of statement that Bopp and his school hav solvd no glottogonic problems, and that Schleicher and others hav never been led to important discoveries by analogies between languages and organic beings, objection is taken.

As to the third position all ar agreed. Among the forces found at work two ar dwelt on by Prof. Sievers as specialy prominent: phonetic variation, and formation by analogy. The first is the substitution of one sound or sound-group for another. He labors to show that such changes admit of no exceptions. This may answer as an elementary guide for framing laws from statistical tabls of fenomena; state the laws so as to cover the fenomena. But it is desirabl to aim at induction of powers; and Sievers seems to think that powers do operate, and change at once the mode of articulation of every man speaking a language in every word he speaks. Americans ar in the midst of changes, and ar abl to observ that the spred of new sounds is gradual, like other habits. There is a fair field here for stoicheiogonic investigation.

As to analogy, Sievers' main point is that it is apt to be entirely arbitrary and irregular. He givs exampls of peculiar inflection: as, *foot, feet*, compared with *book, books; ride, rode*, compared with *bind, bound*. These, he says, ar entirely arbitrary. They must be accepted as facts not allowing any special explanation.

The reasns for these changes wer givn, and it was said that everything in language has its reasn, and should be hunted to its laws of mind and matter. Science should not deliberately set apart a refuge for ignorance.

Objection was made to the word *level* for the operation of analogy; *conform* was thought better. The minority conform to the majority. Forms may wether to a level from fonetic decay, or from other external causes.

Sievers says that the most brilliant result of the recent researches is the discovery that the system of etymological vowel change which pervades the Aryan inflection was chiefly developed under the influence of stress and pitch. "This," Prof. March said, "I read with great satisfaction. I, too, am a junggrammatiker of a primaeval period. But as I read on the world seems to turn topsy-turvy. The old linguistic tree is bottom up. *Vid* and *vaid, bhug'* and *bhaug'*, ar here, but the *vaids* and *bhaug's* ar now the roots from which *vids* and *bhug's* spring. It might be said, that, if it is agreed that unaccented *i* corresponds with accented *ai*, it makes no difference which is calld the root. But a comparison of the words in Sanskrit, Greek, and the like, containing these sounds, as wel as a general comparison with the sounds of all languages, indicates *i* and *u* to be primitiv sounds, while a study of English and other living languages assures us that historicaly *ai* follows its *i*, *au* follows its *û*; *lîf* was before *laif*, *nû* before *nau*. Sievers says that the English *milord, milady*, against the usual full *my* (*mai*), is an exact parallel to Sanskrit *vidmá* against *vaida*. But *my* (*mai*) is a lengthening of *mî*, so then *vaid* of *vid*."

Remarks were made upon the paper by Professor Whitney and Mr. Cyrus Adler, and in reply by Professor March.

Professor Whitney said: —

While the so-called neo-grammatical movement is indeed a highly interesting and important one, having brought much new truth to light, and wholesomely stirred up many questions which by prevalent opinion had been erroneously regarded as settled, its range and scope should not be mistaken nor its originality overstated. The truth of the three characteristics just laid down he could by no means admit. If the first, indeed, were a true characteristic, it would constitute the irrevocable condemnation of the new movement; since every language is the product of a series of historical changes, and to trace these out and to discover their causes is the scientific study of language. The question whether *vaid* precedes *vid*, or the contrary, is a "glottogonic problem" as much as any other; and all the other questions as to what precedes what in language-history are of the same sort, and have an equal claim to be investigated; to set aside any part of them as insoluble, is simply unscientific. As regards the second point, if one really understands what language is, and what are the forces that shape its growth, and how in general they act, he is in no danger of being misled by organic metaphors, but may find them interesting, and sometimes even instructive. That caution as to using such metaphors is a peculiar merit of the new school is a claim without any foundation whatever. Then, that one must study the growth of living languages in order to understand that of older ones, is a truism; no one who knew anything about the science of language has thought of disputing it. And there are phases of it which are calling vainly for the attention of the new school. From it results, for example, that agglutination, with consequent adaptation, is the only process by which grammatical structure in language can be brought into existence; and hence that the glottogonic problems relating to the genesis of forms occupy as high a place in linguistic science as does grammatical structure in the development of language.

General opinion attributes to the new school, as the most essential article in its creed, the invariability of phonetic change. But that is not an induction, nor a deduction; it is simply an assumption, a hypothesis as yet undemonstrated, and probably never to be demonstrated. Such a doctrine should be the final goal, not the starting-point, of a new school.

6. The Genealogy of Words, by Professor Morton W. Easton, of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; read, in the author's absence, by Professor W. B. Owen, of Lafayette College.

This paper was, in substance, an extension of the principle of analogy to nearly the whole field of phonetic changes and law.

The syllables and the groups of letters most frequently used determine the direction of alteration in form. *These, and not the single sounds, are to be regardea as the phonetic units*, and a change in the phonetic constitution of a word should be, in the great majority of cases, attributed not to ease in enunciation alone, but to unconscious imitation of some other more frequently uttered vocable. Ellis attributes the change of *pers-u-ade* to "*perswade*" to the influence of the current combination *qu* (sounded *kw*). This may be taken as a type of the whole process.

A great variety of phenomena were attributed to this process: sporadic

changes, such as the confusion of *clad* and *glad* (including *clory* for *glory*); of *kin* and *can;* the displacement of *-ung* by *-ing;* of the proper representative of *-ig* by *-ow*, as in *hallow* for *hālig;* palatalization; labialization; inorganic sounds; anaptyctic sounds; cases such as the initial vowel in ὄρφος, etc., etc.

Support for this theory and fuller illustration were sought in the history of the changes of the English vowel system, especially of *a, e, i.*

7. The Appeal to the Sense of Sight in Greek Tragedy, by Professor Rufus B. Richardson, of Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

There is in Greek tragedy an evident lack of scenes of violence such as are common on the modern stage. Things of this sort are relegated to the parts of the ἄγγελοι and ἐξάγγελοι.

A widely prevalent view is that the Greeks avoided, on principle, presenting the horrible to the eye, either because it was too overpowering, or, on the contrary, (e. g. Köchly, Vorlesung über Sophokles' Antigone,) because it was not so effective a means of reaching the soul as vivid narration. Whether the Greeks were ruled by any such principle is doubtful. A review of the passages in Aristotle's Poetics bearing on this point, especially vi. 7, 8, vi. 19, and ix. 6, fails to establish an affirmative.

Turning to the Greek tragedies themselves, we find the Bacchae of Euripides completely upsetting any preconceived notions that horrible scenes must be avoided. Everything in that play leads up to the crowning horror presented when Agave appears bearing the bloody head of her son.

A review of all the extant Greek tragedies yields the following result. Presentation of the horrible to the eye is avoided only when it would be difficult to maintain the *illusion* in the matter. Bloody bodies are shown, even if, as in Euripides's Andromache and Suppliants, they are thought of as brought from some distant place for that very purpose.

Suicide might be successfully represented, but anything like a combat was almost incapable of successful representation by Greek actors, who were practically set up on stilts, with the danger of an awkward fall ever threatening them. (Lucian, Somnium, 26.) A laugh inadvertently raised by a too venturesome attempt at representation would be fatal to the proper effect of the piece. Moderns sin against this principle, and pay the penalty for it. Gessler's fall from his horse, in Schiller's Wilhelm Tell, generally raises a laugh.

The much quoted passage from Horace, Ars Poetica, 179 ff., though often taken as discriminating against scenes of bloodshed *per se*, really sets forth the need of care not to break the illusion of the spectator. To show the transformation of Cadmos and Procne, or the doings of Atreus and Medea, awakens incredulity, and so disgust. *Incredulus odi* covers all four cases.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Dr. E. G. Sihler, and by Professors M. L. D'Ooge, W. W. Goodwin, and W. T. Hewett.

8. The Value of the Attic Talent in modern Money, by Professor W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.

In the table at the end of Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities the value of the Solonic talent is given as £243 15*s.* and this has generally been accepted as

the correct value in England, while the corresponding value of $1,200 is usually adopted in the United States. The difference between this value and Boeckh's estimate of 1,500 Prussian thalers for the Attic talent, is surprising. If we estimate the weight of pure silver in the talent at 404,283 grains Troy (the drachma having 67.38 gr.), we get the equivalent of about $1,088 in the present U. S. "standard" dollars (each containing 371.25 grains of *pure* silver), or less than $1,000 in honest money. This agrees with the only fair estimate in English money, by which 404,283 grains Troy are equivalent to £200 when pure silver is worth 57*d.* per ounce Troy and English standard silver (.925 fine) is worth 52.7*d.* When this was the ordinary value of silver, the weight of silver which made an Attic talent (about 57¾ pounds avoirdupois) would have been worth about £200, or less than $1,000. Within the last few months, however, silver has fallen about ten per cent below this value (to about 47½*d.* per ounce), which of course reduces the *present* value of the talent (on a gold basis) to £180, or less than $900.

The cause of the error of more than £40 in the estimates in Smith's Dictionary is not far to seek. In the article *Drachma*, the weight of the Solonic drachma is assumed to be 65.4 grains; and this is divided by the weight of pure silver in the English shilling (80.7 grains) to get the value of the drachma, which thus appears to be 9.72*d.*, making the value of the talent (6,000 drachmas) £243. But if 80.7 grains of pure silver were worth a shilling, an ounce Troy of silver (480 gr.) would be worth nearly six shillings, or 72*d.* It is plain that the error here arises from comparing the Attic drachma, which is reckoned at its full value as pure silver, with the shilling, which is merely a subsidiary coin (strictly limited as legal tender) containing less than ninepence worth of silver; and the error thus introduced is of course multiplied *six thousand times* in estimating the value of the talent.

9. The Vowels *e* and *i* in English, by Benjamin W. Wells, Ph. D., of the Friends' School, Providence, R. I.

The writer traced the origin of Old Germanic *e* to IG. a^1, and of OG. *i* to IG. *i* in most cases, but endeavored to show that there was a considerable number of cases where OG. *i* was derived from an IG. a^1, and a very few where OG. *e* was from IG. *i*. The development of OG. *e* and *i* in OE. was then shown; under what conditions OG. *e* became in OE. *éo*, *íe*, or *ié*, and when it remained *e*; how *i* remained *i* in most cases, but also became *e* and *éo* in OE.

The second section showed the origin of the OE. sounds *i*, *íe*, *ié*, *e*, *éo*. *i* was shown to be from OG. *i* in most cases, but also from *e* and *ī*. OE. *e* was traced to OG. *a* (umlaut), to OG. *e*, and to OG. *i* and *ai* in rare instances. OE. *éo* was shown to be from OG. *e* and *i*, without regard to their origin, and from no other source; *íe* was regarded as the umlaut of *éo*, showing that the "breaking" of *e* to *éo* was previous to the umlaut in Germanic; *ié* was shown to be a late and irregular development from *e* after palatals.

The next section spoke of the development of OE. sounds in NE. The ME. was passed over, as adding little to our knowledge except in exceptional cases. The NE. sounds were made the basis of the comparison, and the notation used for these was that of Brücke: ĭ *hit*, i *heed*, e^a *tell*, e *hate*, æ *hat*, a *far*, o^a *or*, o *home*, ŏ *not*, $ŏ^e$ *fur*, ŭ *hut*, u *shoot*, ai *kite*, au *cow*. OE. *i* was pronounced in

NE. usually *ĭ*, but often *i*, *e*^{a}, *ai*, *ŏ*^{e}, *u*, *o*. OE. *e* was usually pronounced *e*^{a}, but also *i*, *e*, and less commonly *ĭ*, *ae*, *a*, *ŏ*, *ŏ*^{e}. OE. *íe*, *ié*, were found, with rare exceptions, to be treated as if only the accented vowel were present; that is, as if they were *i* and *e*. OE. *éo* was very irregular in its development, being represented by the sounds *ĭ*, *i*, *e*^{a}, *ae*, *ai*, *a*, *o*^{a}, *o*, *ŏ*, *ŏ*^{e}; and these variations do not always admit of satisfactory explanation. OE. *éa* also presents many difficulties. We find *e*^{a} and *a* frequently for this sound, but also *o*^{a}, *ae*, *e*, *ŏ*, *o*. OE. *ae* is usually pronounced *e*, *oe*, or *a* in NE., but also *i*, *e*^{a}, *o* , *o*, *ŏ*, in some cases. The changes in sound are usually due to following consonants, liquids and *w* being especially active. The spelling is in general dependent on the sound, though it is much more irregular.

In the fourth section the NE. sounds were traced back to their OE. origins. NE. *ĭ* was found to come from *i* or *y* usually, but also from *ī*, *ȳ*, *ē*, *œ*, *ēa*, *ēo*, and *u*, in exceptional cases. The sound *e* in NE. is usually from OE. *a* or *œ*, but also for OE. *e*, *éa*, *y*, *ē*, *ēa*, *eā*, *ā*, *ōē*. The sound *e*^{a} is used for OE. *e*, *ié*, regularly, and also for *i*, *éo*, *éa*, *ae*, *a*, *o*, *y*, and *īe*, *ē*, *ēo*, *ēa*, *ōē*, *eā*, *ō*, in exceptional cases. The sound *ae* is used in NE. for OE. *a* and *ae*, and sometimes for *e*, *éo*, *éa*, *ē*, *ēa*, *ōē*, *ā*. Notice was taken throughout of the spellings used for the NE. sounds.

The fifth section treated of the NE. letters. Of the thirty-two signs for vowel sounds, nine were found to be French, and used only in foreign words. Of the remaining twenty-three, the following twelve were treated here: *i*, *e*, *y*, *ai*, *ay*, *ea*, *ee*, *ei*, *ey*, *ew*, *ie*, *ye*. *i* has the sounds *i* and *ai*, and is the usual representative of those sounds. *e* is used for the sound *e*^{a} regularly, often for *ŏ*^{e}, and sometimes for *i*; it stands for seventeen OE. sounds. *y* is used for *ĭ*, *ai*; it is the final sign for NE. *i*. *ai* and *ay* are used for the sounds *e*, *e*^{a}, and in French words for the sound *ai*; nearly always this digraph stands for a vowel + *g* in OE. *ei*, *ey*, occur with the sounds *i*, *e*, *e*^{a}, *oi*, but are never regular signs for any OE. vowel. *ea* has the sounds *i*, *e*^{a}, *O*^{e}, and rarely *e*; it is used for fourteen OE. sounds. *ee* is always sounded *i* except in the short pronunciation of *been;* it is used for seven OE. sounds. *ie*, *ye* are used with the sounds *i*, *ĭ*, *ai*, *e*^{a}, but never regularly. *ew* is used for the sounds *u* and *o*, and always represents a vowel + *w* in OE.

The general tendency of the vowel changes is from *a* toward *i* in the period from OG. to OE.; and since the OE. times the tendency is downward toward *a* and *u* for short vowels, and toward the extremes *i* and *u* in the long vowels.

10. An unpublished Introduction to Hesiod's Works and Days, by Professor Isaac H. Hall, of New York, N. Y.

One of the three classic manuscripts recently acquired by the Astor Library is a paper manuscript of Hesiod's Works and Days, of the thirteenth century. It is clearly and beautifully written, and contains an Introduction — filling two pages of twenty-three lines each, or forty-six lines in all — which is said to be found in none of the many editions of the poet, and to have been hitherto unknown. The MS. consists of thirty-four leaves, each 24½ × 17 centimeters in dimension, and presents a singularly good text. On the fly-leaf at the beginning is written in uncials, all in one line except the last word, —

ΚΑΚΗ᾽ ΓΥΝΗ᾽ ΜΕΓΑ ΠΗ͂ΜΑ ΤΩ͂Ι ᾽ΑΝΔΡΙ᾽· ᾽ΙΗΕΣΟΥ͂Σ ·⁚· ΧΡΙΣΤΟ᾽Σ·

— : ΜΑΡΙ᾽Α : —

The first 274 verses of the poem, with also verse 499, have an interlinear gloss, written in red ink, which gives a paraphrase of Hesiod's expressions; sometimes explaining almost every word, but not always either explaining or repeating. The following half-dozen lines (three pairs), taken from the beginning of the poem, show its character. This particular portion is selected as a specimen because of its bearing on the Introduction above mentioned. The gloss is written above its line: —

1ª	ὦ	ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους	ποιήσεσι	δοξάζουσαι	
1	Μοῦσαι	πιερίηθεν	ἀοιδῆσι	κλείουσαι	
2ª	ἄγετε	εἴπατε	ἴδιον	τὸν	ὑπανοῦσαι
2	δεῦτε δὴ	ἐννέπετε,	σφέτερον	πατέρ'	ὑμνείουσαι
3ª	δι' οὕτινος	ἄνδρες	ὁμοίως	ἀνώνυμοι	ὀνοματοὶ
3	ὃν τε διὰ	βροτοὶ ἄνδρες	ὁμῶς	ἄφατοί τε	φατοί τε

In line 3 of the poem above, ἄφατοί was written ἄφωτοί, but corrected by the scribe himself.

The Introduction is as follows: —

Ἡσίοδος:

Line 1. Ἰστέον ὅτι πάντα οἱ Ἕλληνες ἃ δύναμιν ἔχοντα
2. ἑώρων οὐκ ἄνευ ἐπιστασίας θεῶν τὴν δύναμιν
3. αὐτῶν ἐνεργοῦντα ἐνόμιζον· ἑνὶ δὲ ὀνόματι, τό τε τὴν
4. δύναμιν ἔχον καὶ τὸν ἐπιστατοῦντα τούτο θεὸν
5. ὠνόμαζον· ὅθεν Ἥφαιστον ἐκάλουν, τό τε δια-
6. κονικὸν τοῦτο πῦρ, καὶ τὸν ἐπιστατοῦντα ταῖς διὰ
7. τούτου ἐνεργουμέναις τέχναις· καὶ Δήμητρα
8. τὸν σῖτον καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς· καὶ τὴν δωρουμένην
9. τούτους θεὸν καὶ ἐπιστατοῦσαν αὐτοῖς. καὶ Ἀθηνᾶν
10. τὴν φρόνησιν καὶ τὴν ἔφορον τῆς φρονήσεως θεὸν· καὶ
11. Διόνυσον τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν διδόντα τοῦτον θεὸν·
12. ὃν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ διδόναι τὸν οἶνον ὁ Πλάτων πα-
13. ράγει, καὶ διδό|νυσον τοῦτον ποιεῖ· εἶτα καὶ Διό-
14. νυσον· καὶ Εἰλειβυίας τοὺς τόκους καὶ τὰς ἐφορώσας
15. τοὺς τόκους θεὰς· καὶ Ἀφροδίτην τὴν συνουσίαν·
16. καὶ τὴν ἐπιστατοῦσαν ταύτῃ θεον· κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ Μοῦσας
17. ἔλεγον· τὰς δὲ λογικὰς τέχνας· οἷον ῥητορικὴν·
18. ἀστρονομίαν· κωμοδίαν· τραγωδίαν, καὶ τὰς
19. ἐφόρους καὶ περιόχους τούτων θεὰς· ἃς ἐνταῦθα
20. καλεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Πιερίας τοῦ ὄρους ἔνθα ἐτι-
21. μῶντο· αὐτόθι δὲ καὶ γεγενιῆσθαι αὐτὰς
22. ἔλεγον· καὶ φησὶν· ὦ Μοῦσαι αἱ δοξάζουσαι
23. τῇ δωρεᾷ τῶν ὑμετέρων ᾠδῶν οὓς ἂν
24. ἐθέλητε δή· αἱ ἔργα ἔχουσαι ὑμνεῖν τὸν ὑμέτερον
25. πατέρα ἠδὲ τὸν Δία· ἄγετε εἴπατέ μοι ἀπὸ τῆς διερίας,
26. ἐκεῖνον δι' ὃν οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως βρότοι ἠδὲ φατοί·
27. ἀνώνυμοι εἰσὶ καὶ ὀνομαστοί, καὶ ῥητοὶ καὶ ἄρρητοι
28. ἐκ παραλλήλου· τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα δύναται,
29. ἃ τὸ ἄφατοι καὶ φατοί· εἶτα παράγει τὰς μοῦσας

30. ὥσπερ ἀποκρινομένας αὐτῷ· καὶ τὸν Δία λε-
31. γούσαις εἶναι τούτων αἴτιον· πρὸς ὃν ἀποβλέ-
32. ψας αὐτὸς, αἰτεῖται ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ· εἶτα
33. ἄρχεται τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν παραινέσεως· καὶ ταῦτα
34. δὲ οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει πρὸς αὐτὸν τὴν παραίνεσιν· ἐν οἷς
35. οὐκ αὐτομάτου δείκνυται τὰ πράγματα γίνεσθαι·
36. ἀλλ' εἶναι τὸν διὰ τούτων ἔφορον καὶ προστάτην· καὶ τοὺς
37. μὲν δικαίους ἀγαθοποιοῦντας· τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας
38. δὲ, τιμωρούμενον· ἄδικος γὰρ ὢν
39. ὁ Πέρσης καὶ πλεονέκτης,
40. διὰ τούτων ὥσπερ
41. ἀναστέλλεται καὶ
42. παιδα-
43. γωγεῖται δικαιοσύνην
44. προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν· ἵνα μὴ τῆς τοῦ Διὸς ὀργῆς
45. πειρασθῇ· τὴν πλεονεξίαν ὁρῶντος
46. αὐτοῦ: —

In the margin, opposite the end of line 12, is written διατί λέγεται Διόνυσος.

There is no ι subscript, but I have supplied it above. Tachygraphic signs are generally simple, and occur with short words or terminations. Accents (as frequently in MSS.) often have to decide what the termination is (e. g. as between τούτῳ and τοῦτο). Points at the top, middle, and bottom of the line, with the modern comma, are about the only punctuation; and it is doubtful whether the points at the top and bottom of the line are not really intended to be in the middle. Grave accents are written irrespective of punctuation; or rather, as if there were no punctuation, except in one or two instances. Ligatures are few, and generally easy. The breathings of the capital letters are the early ones, namely, halves of the split **H**; elsewhere they are like the modern ones. Capitals are not used in the body of the Introduction; only with its initial letter and that of its title. *Iota* has the common two points at the top. Hyphens are written where a word is broken at the end of a line. In line 28 (as in line 3 of the poem), ἄφατοι was written ἄφωτοι, but corrected by the scribe himself. In line 21, the reading γεγενῆσθαι has no mark of correction. In line 38, τιμωρούμενον was written τιμωρούρομενον, but a mark of erasure is drawn through the superfluous letters. In line 13, an irregular perpendicular line is drawn through the word διδό|ννσον, apparently by the scribe, to show its elements. In line 4, τούτο appears to be an error for either τοῦτο or τούτῳ (more likely the latter, though the final ο is written below the τ). In line 16, θεον has no accent written.

Except as here stated, the Introduction is given line for line with the original MS., copying the punctuation, hyphens, accents, and breathings. The few other clerical errors of the scribe are so obvious that it is hardly worth while to note them. I do not deem it necessary to add a translation. The use of ἔφορος is a little noteworthy. (In the poem, line 122, ἔφοροι is the gloss for φύλακες). In line 14, the form Εἰλειβυίας is also noteworthy.

The afternoon session of Wednesday was omitted, that the members of the Association and their friends might make the excursion to

which, on the preceding day, they had been invited by Professor Tracy Peck, on behalf of the resident members of the Association and other citizens of New Haven.

At about 3 P. M., nearly one hundred and fifty persons, members of the Association and friends in New Haven, proceded to Belle Dock, where the barge Juno was in waiting for the party. The sail was down the harbor of New Haven, and eastward upon the Sound till off Brantford, and back to the breakwater, near which the barge passed. The city was reached, after a delightful sail of about four hours, at 7 P. M.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., Wednesday, July 8, 1885.

EVENING SESSION.

In the temporary absence of the President, the Association was called to order by the Secretary at 8.10 P. M.

The reading of papers was at once resumed: —

11. The Roots of the Sanskrit Language, by Professor W. D. Whitney, of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Passing over all the difficult questions attaching to the word "root," and using it simply in its current and sufficiently understood sense, there are certain special difficulties attending the identification of the Sanskrit roots, arising chiefly from the fact that the Hindu grammarians have set up a faulty, and in great part fictitious, list of them. Not only do these authorities omit a considerable number of real roots, found in the older memorials of the language though obsolete in the classical period, but, what is much worse, they add a very considerable number — even the larger half of the whole list — that are unquotable from the literature, and will always remain so, being in the main evidently fictitious, and in the rest part presumably so. Moreover, as a matter of course, the native writers on grammar make no attempt to distinguish between earlier and later roots, between (apparently) primary and secondary roots: all are given upon the same dead level. Hence it has been very difficult for the Indo-European etymologist to distinguish between what he has and what he has not a right to use in this body of material; and, to help establish the history of a word, there has been in numberless instances a "Sanskrit root" called in which has not the smallest right to figure as such, being either the figment of a grammarian, or something that shows itself for the first time in some recent period of the history of the Sanskrit itself. The great Petersburg Lexicon of Sanskrit (with its abridgment and supplement, Böhtlingk's minor Lexicon, not yet quite finished) furnishes the means at present of bettering this state of things, by distinguishing the genuine and quotable from the non-authentic, and by illustrating the period of use of any given root. But the Lexicon is comparatively

a rare book, and not easily usable, even when accessible, except by one who is a practised Sanskrit scholar; nor, in very many cases, is it easy for such a one to bring its evidence to bear upon a given point. The writer has been engaged during some years past in endeavoring to facilitate the task, by preparing (as a supplement to his Sanskrit Grammar) a work entitled "The Roots, Verb-Forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language," which is just now (July, 1885) leaving the press at Leipzig. In it are given all the quotable roots, with all the tense-formations made from them that have been met with hitherto in use, and with their derivatives usually reckoned as primary — each and every item being dated according to the period to which it belongs in the history of the language, so far as yet ascertained; and such is the completeness with which the literature has been excerpted, that any further modifications to be made will be only of minor consequence. In order, now, to make the main results of this work, so far as concerns the roots themselves and their place in the language, yet more readily accessible, the writer had drawn off from that work a classified List of Roots, with the briefest possible explanatory statement under each one, and offers it to the Association for publication in its Transactions.

The List begins with those roots which are found in use through the whole history of the language, from the Vedic down even to the latest or classical period; and next follow those which are met with in the Vedas, while they are either restricted to those works, or at least occur only in the older language — since (unless in rare and exceptional cases) it must be among these alone that materials for Indo-European etymologies have a right to be sought. Then follow those that first show themselves at periods later than the Vedic: as in the Brāhmaṇas, the Sūtras, in the epics, and, finally, in the latest period only — the probability of Indo-European value growing less in each successive division. An alphabetic index at the end gives the means of determining the place and period of any given root sought.

It is sufficient to add here a few of the roots, as specimens of the method followed. In the first division, or under the head of roots found occurring at every period, from the Vedic to the classical, the first ones are the following: —

1 akṣ.
Secondary, from **1 aç**. Only sporadic cases.

ac, añc, bend.
Hardly used after B. except in caus. and deriv. Query whether **-añc (pratyañc**, etc.) is this root or a suffix.

aj, drive.
Hardly used after S. except in derivatives.

añj, anoint.
Rare in later lang., except pple, caus., and derivatives.

at, wander.
Rare, pers. forms only in RV.; compare **at**.

ad, eat.

an, breathe.
Rarer later; some deriv. common throughout.

arc, ṛc, praise.

arh, deserve, etc.
Grows more common later.

av, favor.
Much rarer later, as also deriv., unless **avi**.

1 aç, attain.
Compare **2 aç** and **1 akṣ**; little used later.

2 aç, partake of.
Probably ultimately the same with **1 aç**.

1 as, be.
Abundant throughout. Few derivatives.

And so on, through the whole list.

It may be added, that the list contains (apart from obviously secondary forms) somewhat over eight hundred roots, just about half of them belonging to the

first division, or occurring in every period of the history of the language; while about a hundred and fifty more are found in the Vedas, but drop out later, at one or another stage in the history. About a hundred and twenty-five occur only in the later language, epic and classical; of these, rather more than half are wanting even in the epics.

On invitation of the President, the Rev. Dr. William Hayes Ward, Editor of *The Independent*, recently returned from the Wolfe Expedition to Babylonia, made a few remarks upon the work and the results of the expedition.[1]

The speaker gave a familiar account of the Wolfe Expedition to Babylonia, stating that it had its origin in the feeling of a number of the members of the American Oriental Society that it was time that steps should be taken to cultivate the interest of American people in the field of Assyrian and Babylonian investigation. A committee had been appointed three years ago to see if an expedition to Mesopotamia could not be provided for, which should, in a preliminary way, examine the field, and report in America whether there was reason to believe that further excavations would be of profit. Miss Catherine Lorillard Wolfe, of New York, gave $5,000 for this purpose, and the speaker was requested by the committee to take charge of the expedition. Dr. Ward left New York on September 6, 1884, and, after spending some days in the British Museum and the Louvre with the Assyrian collections there, went to Constantinople and Smyrna, where he was joined by Mr. J. H. Haynes and Dr. J. R. S. Sterrett, two young American gentlemen who had for several years been devoting themselves to archaeological investigations in Asia Minor. The party then went to Mersin by steamer, whence they went inland, by way of Tarsus, Adana, the old Hittite capital now known as Marash, and Aintab, to Jerabis, the site of the larger Hittite capital of Carchemish. After making observations and taking photographs of exposed sculptures, the party went by way of Urfa, Mardin, and through the Syriac-speaking country of the Tûr Abdîn to Mosul. Here visiting the famous Ninevite centres of Koyunjik, Nebby Yunus, Khorsabad, and Nimrûd, they went down the east side of the Tigris through Arbela and Kerkuk to Baghdad. Thence they passed by way of Abu Habba to the mounds of Babylon and Borsippa, and through nearly the whole of Southern Babylonia, including such famous mounds as Zibliya, Niffer, Hammam, Tello, Zerghul, Mugheir, and Warka. Observations were made everywhere with the prismatic compass, for the correction of maps. The party visited nearly all places where excavations have been made, located many sites of old towns never before visited, and made such observations as the limited time allowed, with a view to future work. They also put themselves in communication with all those who made it a business to collect and sell antiquities. Returning to Baghdad with their caravan in season to avoid the spring floods, they crossed over again to the Euphrates at Sakhlawieh, where they discovered the magnificent ruins of the mediaeval Anbar, the site of old Sippara, and thence passed up the west side of the Euphrates by Hit (Issus) and Anah (Anatho) to Ed Deir. Thence they crossed the Syrian Desert

[1] The official report of the expedition will soon be published by the Archaeological Institute of America.

to Palmyra, where they spent several days taking squeezes of Palmyrene inscriptions. Thence they went by way of Emesa to Damascus, and reached the sea-coast at Beirut. Everywhere photographs were taken. The expedition was indebted to the Turkish officials everywhere, and to the Turkish government, for much courtesy and attention. The result was a considerable addition to geographical data, and the discovery of many places where there is every reason to believe that excavation would produce rich fruit. A number of tablets and other smaller engraved objects are among the fruits of the expedition.

In accordance with votes of instruction, the following Committees were then announced by the President of the Association: —

Committee to nominate Officers for 1885–86, Professors W. D. Whitney, R. B. Richardson, and W. S. Scarborough.

Committee to arrange Time and Place of next Meeting, Professors F. A. March, T. D. Seymour, and W. G. Hale.

The report of the Treasurer of the Association for the year ending July 7, 1885, was then presented by Professor John H. Wright, Secretary and Treasurer. The summary of accounts for 1884–85 is as follows: —

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, July 3, 1884		$635.29
Fees, assessments, and arrears paid in	$718.00	
Sales of Transactions	159.50	
Sales of reprints, etc.	11.75	
Interest on deposits	8.21	
Total receipts for the year		897.46
		$1532.75

EXPENDITURES.

Plates for Vol. XIV. (1883) of Transactions	$325.34	
700 copies of Proceedings for 1883 separate	30.10	
600 copies of Vol. XIV. (Trans. and Proc. together)	107.71	
Reprints of separate articles for authors	21.50	
Job printing	30.80	
Plates for Proceedings for 1884	183.99	
750 copies of Proceedings for 1884	46.60	
Mailing, shipping, expressage, postage, and stationery	55.61	
Miscellaneous (advertising, binding, writing, etc.)	18.50	
Total expenditures for the year		$820.15
Balance on hand, July 6, 1885		712.60
		$1532.75

The chair appointed, as Committee to audit the report, Professor A. Harkness and C. J. Buckingham, Esq.

12. Negro-English,[1] by Professor James A. Harrison, of Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

"The area embraced within the ensuing investigation is the area lying between the Atlantic Ocean on the East, the Mississippi River on the West, the Gulf of Mexico on the South, and 39° north latitude ('Mason and Dixon's line,' a name given to the southern boundary of the free State of Pennsylvania, which separates it from the former slave States of Maryland and Virginia).

"This area now contains between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 negroes, who speak, in large measure, the English to which attention is drawn in this paper. There are several distinctly marked dialects of this English, — prevailing respectively in Virginia, on the sea-coast of South Carolina and Georgia, and through the middle Southern States, — examples of which are given at the end of the paper.

"It has been impossible to register scientifically the varied phenomena of Negro phonetics or to reproduce the quite indescribable intonation and shades of intonation with which the sounds are uttered; but an effort has been made to approximate a correct reproduction of the pronunciation by an imitative orthography, and by key-words serving to show the dialectal variations of different localities.

"It must be confessed, to the shame of the white population of the South, that they perpetuate many of these pronunciations in common with their Negro dependents; and that, in many places, if one happened to be talking to a native with one's eyes shut, it would be impossible to say whether a Negro or a white person were responding.

"The humor and naïveté of the Negro are features which must not be overlooked in gauging his intellectual caliber and timbre; much of his talk is baby-talk, of an exceedingly attractive sort to those to the manner born; he deals in hyperbole, in rhythm, in picture-words, like the poet; the slang which is an ingrained part of his being, as deep-dyed as his skin, is, with him, not mere word-distortion; it is his verbal breath of life, caught from his surroundings and wrought up by him into the wonderful figure-speech specimens of which will be given later under the head of Negroisms.

"The results of a total abstraction of all means of self-cultivation from the field of Negro life are clearly enough seen in the representations which follow of his treatment of the English tongue. Negro English is an *ear-language* altogether, a language built up on what the late Professor Haldeman of Pennsylvania called *otosis*, an error of ear, a mishearing, similar to that by which Sirâdyhu-d-daula, a viceroy of Bengal, became in the newspapers of the day Sir Roger Dowler! The only wonder is how the Negro could have caught the rapidly uttered sounds of the language spoken around him so truly, and reproduced them so ingeniously, transmitting what he had learned in a form so comparatively unspoiled. He has simply taken the principle of *paresis*, or word-neglect, — a principle by which *maculate* becomes *mote* (a spot), — and worked it out to its ultimate consequences, so far as English is concerned. If his masters say *won't*, *sha'n't*, why should not he say *dasen't* ('dares not') and use it for

[1] The paper was originally printed in *Anglia* (Leipzig), 1884, and only portions were read before the Association. The Introduction, with an abstract of the contents of the paper, is here reproduced.

every person? If his master says, paroptically, *énjīne* (so-called long *i*), why should not he say *ínjīne* (for 'éngĭne')? If euphemism so dominates the master that, in his oaths, he must say *dad blame* for something much stronger, why should not the Negro catch it and apply it analogically to a whole class of expressions (see Interjections)?

"Such parasynetic forms as *sparrer-grass* for *asparagus*, due to misunderstanding or misconception of a word, are common enough in Negro; but the African, from the absence of books and teaching, had no principle of *analepsy* in his intellectual furnishing by which a word, once become obscure from a real or supposed loss of parts or meaning, can be repaired, amended, or restored to its original form. He is continually led by analogies, and induced by classes of words like *gift*, *lift*, to add, for example, a *t* to *cliff*, if indeed he can be got at all to pronounce this, to him, very difficult final dental.

"The process of hybridization both in word-formation and in word-pronunciation (if one may so apply the term) is extensively practised by him; for not only have we such formations as *smartually* (smartly) and the like in Negro, but such pronunciations as *ailmént*, *presidént*, *obleege*, (caught from the Romance settlements in the South,) are common enough all over the South among white and black alike.

"The opposite principles of eduction and absorption are actively at work in the processes of Negro speech, giving rise on the one hand to such lengthenings and strengthened forms as corn*d*er, drown*d*ed, clos*t*, 'cross*t*, rous*t*, and on the other to such syncopations and contractions as *'spe'unce* (experience), *cu'ius* (curious), *mo'*, *'membunce*, &c.

"Numerous examples of aphæresis, apocope, syncope, epenthetic insertion, prothesis, epithesis, and metathesis have been collected and are given under these heads in their special section of this paper.

"What has been called *dimorphism* — a principle according to which a word may appear in the course of time under two forms — is not without suggestive illustration in Negro; e. g. the word *admiration* has not only its usual meaning, but, in the form 'to make a great *'miration*,' has gone back to its early meaning of wonder, astonishment; *up* is made to do the duty of a verb in such expressions as 'he *up* en duz'; *allow* comes to signify, additionally, *maintain*, *insist*; *parade* ('perrade') means also *walk*, etc.

"The fertility of the Negro dialect, indeed, is really wonderful, not only in the ingenious distortion of words by which new and startling significance is given to common English words (e. g. a *hant* in Negro means a *ghost*), but more especially in the domain of imitative sounds, cries, animal utterance. To the Negro all nature is alive, anthropomorphized, replete with intelligence; the whispering, tinkling, hissing, booming, muttering, 'zoonin,' around him are full of mysterious hints and suggestions, which he reproduces in words that imitate, often strikingly, the poetic and multiform messages which nature sends him through his auditory nerve. He is on intimate terms with the wild animals and birds, the *flora* and *fauna* of the immense stretches of pine woods among which for generations his habitation has been pitched. His mind is yet in the stage in which ready belief is accorded to the wrangles of shovel and tongs, the loves and hates of dish and platter on the kitchen shelves, the naïve personification of the furniture of his cabin; and for him rabbits and wolves, terrapins and turtles, buzzards and eagles, live lives no less full of drama and incident, of

passion and marvel, than his own kith and kin gathered around the pine-knot or the hickory fire.

"The Negro passion for music and for rhythmic utterance has often been remarked; a Negro sermon nearly always rises to a pitch of exaltation at which ordinary prose accent, intonation, word-order, are too tame to express the streaming emotion within; the sermon becomes a cry, a poem, an improvisation; it is intoned with melodious energy; it is full of scraps of Scripture in poem form, and to say that it becomes an orgy of figures and metaphors sobbed or shouted out with the voice of Boanerges is hardly going at all too far. The sermon style naturally exerts a powerful influence on the style of ordinary life; so that it is not remarkable if the utterance and language of the household and the street are largely cast in a rhythmic mould. Nearly every Negro above the average is a hymn-maker, or at least co-operates with others in the production of hymns, songs, plantation rhymes, 'corn-shucking' glees, 'joubas,' and the like. He invents his own airs and tunes, which are often profoundly touching and musical; his sense of *Takt* is delicate, and in congregational singing his voice has a beauty and richness and justness which often exceed the best efforts of the trained choirs of the cities.

"In this paper the author has endeavored to give merely an outline of Negro language usage, — an outline far from exhaustive or immaculate, but which, he hopes, will attract the attention of better qualified linguists to a series of phenomena which are certainly not devoid of interest. A life-long residence in the Southern States of North America enables him to say that what is here given is at least approximately correct. It will perhaps be several generations before the American public school system has sufficiently penetrated the wilds of the Negro South to render what is here recorded obsolete."

This Introduction was followed by a tolerably exhaustive registration of the phenomena of Negro grammar, including phonetics (Negro treatment of the English vowels, diphthongs, and consonants), aphæresis, syncope, apocope; letters added prothetically, epenthetically, epithetically; metathesis. The chief rubrics of grammar were then systematically taken up, and the Negro manipulation of them was shown in very numerous examples: the articles, definite and indefinite; the noun (formation of plural and of the possessive case); the comparison of adjectives; the personal, emphatic, demonstrative, relative, interrogative, and indefinite pronouns; the numerals (cardinal, ordinal, multiplicative); the verb (regular and irregular); the auxiliary verbs (be, have, etc.); table of principal irregular (Negro) verbs, with numerous observations on peculiar Negro innovations, barbarisms, and corruptions; the adverbs, prepositions, prepositional phrases, and conjunctions; interjections (in which Negro was shown to be peculiarly rich); modes of address, with answers; Negro intensives, expletives, agglutinations; archaisms in Negro surviving from the Elizabethan and Jacobin usage of the early Virginia colonial settlers; and about twenty closely printed pages of representative Negroisms. The entire essay covered about fifty pages octavo.

The reading of portions of the paper gave rise to an interesting discussion, in which it was shown that many of these "Negro" corruptions and provincialisms were known also in New England and elsewhere in the Northern States.

Remarks were made upon the paper by Professor E. S. Sheldon,

Dr. B. W. Wells, Professor A. C. Merriam, Rev. Dr. W. H. Ward, Dr. C. P. G. Scott, and in reply by Professor Harrison.

13. A Study of Dinarchus, by E. G. Sihler, Ph. D., of New York, N. Y.

Even at the time of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, shortly before the beginning of the Christian era, the literary remains of the last of the Attic orators were almost buried under the dust of neglect, and he has not fared much better in later and more modern times. The paper aimed to gather together the data of Dinarchus's life in its professional and political aspects, noting particularly the favorable effect upon the orator's professional prosperity caused by the departure of Aeschines from Athens in 330 B. C. He certainly became a successful servant of Macedonian interests at Athens.

As a speech-writer, Dinarchus was an imitator, not only of Demosthenes, but also of Lysias and Hyperides; but his extant performances show him mainly as an imitator of the former. As regards that kind of imitation which consists in self-iteration and the transcription of passages considered finished and successful, it was shown that Dinarchus was by no means the only one who practised it. In his periods, Dinarchus does not essay symmetrical conformation, but, on the other hand, shows great awkwardness in excessive accumulation; anacolutha are met with which lead him into several cases of bad grammar, or rather lack of grammar. Opportunity for detailed analysis is further afforded in Dinarchus's use of emphatic position; of doubling for the effect of πάθος; of the slander and abuse of the bema, called by the ancient rhetoricians σχετλιασμός; and of δεινότης λέξεως, i. e. the choice of quaint or telling words and phrases. Fairly exhaustive tabulation of instances of the above features was essayed by the author of the paper.

The Association adjourned at 9.50 P. M.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., Thursday, July 9, 1885.

MORNING SESSION.

The President called the Association to order at 9.15 A. M.

The reading of papers was resumed: —

14. The Law Code of the Cretan Gortyna, by Professor A. C. Merriam, of Columbia College, New York, N. Y.[1]

Of the ancient laws of Crete, so famous in antiquity, our literary sources give us but meagre and fragmentary information, and that which has reached us is mainly concerned with the state polity. A year ago this month there was discovered on the site of the ancient Gortyna, one of the three great Cretan towns, an archaic Greek inscription engraved upon the inner surface of a circular wall of antique construction. The writing is arranged in twelve columns, each about

[1] Printed in full in the American Journal of Archaeology, Vols. I. and II.

five feet in height, and extending over nearly thirty feet of the wall in length. The columns contain fifty-three, fifty-four, or fifty-five lines each, written in *boustrophedon* style, beginning from the right, and, with the exception of some thirty or forty lines, it is almost complete. Its state of preservation is most remarkable after the lapse of some twenty-five centuries, and in length and fineness of engraving it is unprecedented among archaic Greek inscriptions.

Its contents introduce us to that branch of law which the Greeks inclined to attribute especially to the mythic name of Rhadamanthus, the rendering of justice as between man and man, defining the rights of individuals and their possessions, and the means of rendering them secure. It treats of the reclamation of slaves, and of freemen held as slaves, fines for rape and adultery, rights of the wife to her property in case of divorce or of second marriage, and its disposition at her death, regulations as to the exposure or bringing up of a child born after divorce, division of property to sons and daughters, the latter receiving one part in three after the sons are put in possession of the houses in the city, of their contents, and of the cattle not owned by the serf. Property goes to children, grandchildren, or to great-grandchildren; in default of these, to brothers of deceased, their children or their grandchildren; next to sisters, their children or grandchildren; then to collateral branches. The judge is to settle all disputes about the division of property, and three or more witnesses must be present at the division. During the father's lifetime a son cannot sell or mortgage any of his father's property, nor the father sell or lend that of his children or wife; but this must be kept intact, though the father manages the property. In case he marries a second time, the mother's estate reverts at once to the children. Then follow provisions relating to the status of children born of parents in different stations of life, and the responsibility of a master for the acts of his slave. The heiress (daughter or daughters without brothers) must marry the father's brother or his son, but the law is rather more lenient than at Athens, and several exceptions are provided for, especially upon the surrender by the heiress of a half of her estate; then her marriage is confined in most cases within the tribe. These enactments are most minute, and cover more ground than any other subject in the code. Regulations provide for cases of death while the individual is held as surety, or involved in some suit; also for limitation of gifts of a son to his mother, or husband to wife, or any person in debt or otherwise involved; for the purchase of property mortgaged or in dispute, the adoption of a son, and his rights and obligations, directions as to the judge's decisions, permission to heirs to give up the property of the deceased to creditors if they wish, and additional provisions in matters of divorce, gifts, and the management of the heiress's property. The code ends with the statement that the heiress may marry at twelve years of age, or older.

The language of the inscription is harsh and archaic Cretan Doric, and is frequently obscure by reason of its brevity, and the number of new words, or old words in new meanings. Its complete explanation is a matter of extreme difficulty, and has not yet been attained.

15. The Relation of the Πρόεδροι to the Πρυτάνεις in the Attic Senate, by Professor William W. Goodwin, of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.

There has been substantial agreement in late years among German scholars in the opinion that the institution of πρόεδροι as presiding officers in the Athenian Senate and Assembly dates from the early part of the fourth century B. C.; that in earlier times the ἐπιστάτης, chosen by the fifty Prytanes from their own number each day by lot, presided in both Senate and Assembly; while in the times of the orators this ἐπιστάτης chose each day by lot nine πρόεδροι, one from each of the ten tribes except his own, who presided in both bodies, choosing as their spokesman one of themselves, who was called ἐπιστάτης τῶν προέδρων. This view, which is based chiefly on Pollux, Onomast. viii. 96, is generally accepted by American scholars. Many distinguished scholars in England, however, have adhered to the opinion once universally held, which has much weaker support in ancient authorities, that each set of fifty Prytanes was subdivided into five sections of ten, each of which sections presided in both Senate and Assembly during one fifth part of each prytany (generally seven days), being then called πρόεδροι; and that each set of πρόεδροι chose a president, called ἐπιστάτης, from their own number, to be their spokesman. This latter view is found, for example, in Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities and Grote's History of Greece; and it survived the text of the last edition of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon (though it is modified in the errata).

It may not be a useless work, therefore, to point out a method by which the truth of one or the other of these opinions may be settled by actual demonstration. If the latter view is correct, the presiding officer in the Senate and Assembly must always belong to the tribe which held the prytany at the time; while, on the other supposition, he must belong to this tribe in the earlier period before the institution of the πρόεδροι, but afterwards he must always belong to one of the other nine tribes.

In the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum* there are twenty-four inscriptions containing Athenian decrees passed between 378 B. C. (the first year when πρόεδροι are expressly mentioned) and 320 B. C., in which we can read the name of the tribe holding the prytany, and also that of the deme of the presiding officer. In none of these cases does the deme of the president belong to the tribe holding the prytany. The earlier inscriptions seldom give the deme of the president; but an inscription belonging to the year of Euclides (303–302 B. C.), published in the *Addenda* to the *C. I. A.*, Vol. II. 1, No. 1^b, contains two decrees of that year, in both of which the president's deme belongs to the tribe holding the prytany. There are no other inscriptions in the *C. I. A.* earlier than 378 B. C. in which the requisite data are to be found. This demonstration seems conclusive.

16. Fatalism in Homer and Virgil, by Professor W. S. Scarborough, of Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio.

Though the religion of the Greeks and Romans is many-sided and many-colored, with a multiplicity of divinities, sub-divinities, quasi-divinities, and allegorical deities or the so-called impersonations of moral forces, there does appear occasionally a manifestation of a belief in one supreme divinity. Homer and Virgil seem fully to recognize the supremacy of the father of gods and men (Hom. Il. i. 5, Od. vi. 187, 188, iv. 235–237). At the same time there are many passages in both poets where the supreme divinity appears to be subject

to a blind impersonal force called Fate. The term Fate (μοῖρα, *fatum*) is often ambiguous and variable in meaning; it is sometimes used of the will of the gods (Virg. Aen. iv. 614), and again of the power behind the gods (Herod. i. 91). Ὑπέρμορα refers to the misery brought upon himself by a mortal, for which the gods are not responsible. Sometimes μοῖρα or *fatum* is equivalent to θάνατος, or *mors*. In spite of this variableness of meaning of the terms designating the controlling force, a careful study of the poems shows that the religious tendency of the Iliad, Odyssey, and Aeneid is decidedly fatalistic, as we use the term. (Compare especially Virg. Aen. i. 39, iv. 360, vii. 255, 584; Hom. Od. v. 41, 42.)

17. The Gothic Bible of Ulfilas, by Rev. Dr. C. K. Nelson, of Brookeville Academy, Brookeville, Md.

After calling attention to the importance of translations of the Bible in philological research, the speaker remarked upon the unique position of the Bible version of Ulfilas, the only considerable relic of the Gothic language in existence. The place of this work in the history of the Goths, and its relation to an earlier stage of the language, were briefly discussed. The life, works, learning, and influence of Ulfilas, the several manuscripts of his translation existing in a fragmentary condition, and the present state of the text, were topics duly passed in review, and the Gothic version of the Lord's Prayer was read as an illustration, not only of the language, but also of Ulfilas's manner of interpretation.

This preliminary survey was followed by a brief sketch of the subsequent fortunes of the Goths and of their tongue, and by a detailed discussion of the position of Gothic among the other Teutonic languages, in which — while comparisons were instituted — its peculiarities in phonetics, accidence, word-formation, syntax, etc. were illustrated by numerous examples.

18. The *siṣ* and *sa* Aorists, or the Sixth and Seventh Forms of Aorist in Sanskrit,[1] by Professor W. D. Whitney, of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The object of this paper was to set forth with all attainable completeness the facts of the occurrence of these forms of aorist in the Sanskrit language. As compared with the other two forms of sibilant or sigmatic aorist (the *s*-aorist and the *iṣ*-aorist), they are only quite exceptionally met with. In the whole body of the Sanskrit literature are found 145 *s*-aorist stems, and 174 *iṣ*-aorist stems; but of the two forms here especially in question, less than a score each.

Forms of the *siṣ*-aorist are made in the Veda from six roots (from three of them, only a single form each): namely, from 2 *gā* 'sing,' 1 *yā* 'go,' 1 *hā* 'leave,' *pyā*, *ram*, and *van*; in the Brāhmaṇas and later, from *jñā* in several forms, with sporadic single forms from *jyā*, *dhyā*, *bhuj*; in the latest language only, one form from *mnā*. Then besides, of forms (2d and 3d sing. active) which admit of reference to either the *siṣ* or the *s*-aorist, there are single cases in the Brāhmaṇas from *drā*, *vā*, and *hvā*, and in the later language from *glā*, *dhmā*, *nam*, *pā*, and *mlā*. To sum up, forms referable with more or less certainty to the *siṣ*-aorist are quotable in Sanskrit from nineteen roots: in the oldest period of the language (Rig-Veda), from two only; in the later Veda and in the

[1] It is printed in full in the American Journal of Philology, Vol. VI. pp. 275–284.

Brāhmaṇa, from only two in more than single sporadic forms, from six others in single forms of unquestionable, and three of questionable character; finally, single examples from six roots in the later language alone, the forms of only one of them unquestionable. Only three roots show forms both in the earlier and in the later language.

It hardly admits of question what is to be inferred from these facts. The first *s* of the tense-sign *siṣ* is an adscititious sibilant added to the root — from which, then, as thus increased, is made the ordinary *iṣ*-aorist. The adscititious *s* is probably that of the aorist itself: that is to say, an *s*-aorist stem has been made the starting-point of a new quasi-radical formation. Secondary roots with final sibilant are far from rare in Sanskrit; and while in some the *s* has been plausibly regarded as desiderative in origin, in others it is plainly aoristic, and in many more conjecturally of the same origin.

The whole *sa*-aorist formation, now, is in just about the same degree sporadic in its character as is the *siṣ*-aorist. It shows itself altogether in the same number of roots as the latter: namely, nineteen. Except from half a dozen roots (*duh, mṛj, mṛç, ruh, spṛç, vṛh*), it occurs only in a scattering form or two; and in the Rig-Veda it is made with any freedom from but two roots (*duh, mṛj*) The other roots from which it is quotable in more than one form are *vṛj* (?), *dviṣ, kṛṣ, kruç, guh, diç, viç;* in a single form only, *druh, piṣ, mih, lih, dṛç, dih.* Five of these show forms both in the earlier and in the later language; the rest, in the earlier only. The formation is limited to roots having such a final consonant as combines regularly with the sibilant to *kṣ*, and having *i* or *u* or *ṛ* as medial vowel. All these things are indicative of an inorganic formation, fortuitously started, and carried but a little way in its development. The middle forms (made only from three roots) would admit of easy explanation as simple transfers to the mode of inflection of an *a*-stem — such as appear abundantly elsewhere, both in conjugation and in declension. In the active, however, the root-vowel of the *s*-aorist has the highest degree of strengthening (*vṛddhi*), while in the *sa*-aorist it remains unchanged: thus, *s*-aorist *adhākṣām*, *sa*-aorist *adhikṣam;* and this appears at present an insurmountable obstacle to the identification of the two forms. But it may not always continue so, when the mechanism of the strengthening comes to be fully understood. At any rate, all indications seem to point toward an accidental origin for the sporadic forms of this aorist, and so to shut them out from any important part in the investigation of the history of the sigmatic aorist.

There remain, then, as the true factors in Sanskrit with which we have to work in studying that history, the *s*-aorist and the *iṣ*-aorist, and these alone. In respect to the sibilant, and to its occurrence without or with a preceding *i* (even to the isolated exception of the long *ī* of root *grah*), this aorist-formation agrees with the *s*-future and with the desiderative. Until good evidence to the contrary can be shown, these three must be regarded as related formations; and no explanation can be accepted as satisfactory for one of them which does not apply also to the others.

19. The Feminine Caesura in Homer, by Professor T. D. Seymour, of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The importance of the caesura in the third foot of the Homeric hexameter is doubted by no one. According to Lehrs, this caesura is lacking in only 219

verses of the Iliad and in 95 of the Odyssey (e. g. διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ). But in this third foot the principal pause falls sometimes after the ictus syllable, and sometimes between the two short syllables. Which is the normal pause, the catalectic or the trochaic close, the masculine or the feminine caesura? Scholars should be agreed as to which is the more frequent; but strange misapprehensions have long and widely prevailed. An examination shows that the feminine caesura is distinctly more frequent than the masculine caesura in the Homeric poems, the ratio in some cases, as in the first book of the Odyssey, being 3 to 2. This is true also in the Homeric hymns, and in the early elegiac poets. A slight investigation shows that the difference between the earliest and the latest Greek hexameters, as regards caesura, is not so great as Hermann thought, and not nearly so great as the difference between the verse of Homer and that of Virgil. But can we ascertain which caesura was preferred by the poet? for the poet may have preferred a form of verse which the material of the language did not allow him to use so frequently as some other form.

A mechanical argument may be drawn from the oft-repeated tags of verses which are arranged to fill up the latter half of the line. Metrical convenience and necessity often determined the choice between synonymous words or phrases, as between ἔμμεναι _ ∪ ∪, ἔμεναι ∪ ∪ _, ἔμμεν _ ∪, ἔμεν ∪ ∪, and εἶναι _ _; or between the epithets of Apollo, ἕκατος ∪ ∪ _, ἑκηβόλος ∪ _ ∪ ∪, ἑκάεργος ∪ ∪ _ ∪, ἑκατηβόλος ∪ ∪ _ ∪ ∪, or ἑκατηβελέτης ∪ ∪ _ ∪ ∪ _. We may expect the same to be true of the epithets of the hero of the Iliad, and we actually find,

Nom.	ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.
Gen.	ποδωκέος Αἰακίδαο.
Dat.	ποδάρκεϊ Πηλεΐωνι.
Acc.	ποδωκέα Πηλεΐωνα, or Ἀχιλλῆα πτολίπορθον.

It is impossible to discover any special difference of meaning which led the poet to say Αἰακίδαο rather than Πηλεΐωνος. The ground for the choice lay in the necessities of the verse. We need not hesitate to say that Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο is the genitive of πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, that Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων is the genitive of ἐυκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί, and that the poet seldom chose between ἐυκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί and κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί, for other reasons than that the one clause could not follow a final consonant, while a final consonant was preferred before the other clause.

A rough count (aided by Schmidt's *Parallel-Homer*) shows that nearly 200 tags fitted to follow the feminine caesura are repeated each five times or more, in all 1932 times; 58 of these tags are repeated each ten times or more, in all 1090 times. 72 tags fitted to follow the masculine caesura are repeated each five times or more, in all 818 times; 27 of these tags are repeated each ten times or more, in all 539 times. Or, in other form:—

	Feminine Caesura.	Masculine Caesura.
(5)	197 tags, 1932 verses.	72 tags, 818 verses.
(10)	58 " 1090 "	27 " 539 "

Other counts might give a slightly differing result, for some tags may have escaped observation. But this count has included for safety's sake all phrases which are thus repeated; if from these we subtract all clauses which in their

nature cannot stand alone, like ἀμείβετο δῖα θεάων, προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, we have a corrected result as follows: 179 feminine tags, occurring 1475 times; in Iliad 871, in Odyssey 604. 47 masculine tags, occurring 376 times; in Iliad 211, in Odyssey 165. The count is accurate enough, however, to show a decided preference for tags to follow the feminine caesura; and since many of these conventional clauses were clearly part of the poet's inheritance from previous generations of bards, we may infer that the feminine or trochaic caesura not only was preferred by Homer, but was also an important characteristic of the earliest Greek hexameter. Nonnus was following in the main Homeric precedent when he established a norm of abundant dactyls and feminine caesuras.

The tags to follow the hephthemimeral caesura alone (i. e. which do not extend to the caesura of the third foot) are not numerous or important. The tags to follow the bucolic diaeresis are so numerous and so oft repeated as to settle all doubts as to the importance of that pause.

Remarks were made upon the paper by Professors A. C. Merriam, W. D. Whitney, W. W. Goodwin, C. R. Lanman, M. L. D'Ooge, and L. S. Potwin, and in reply by Professor Seymour.

Professor Goodwin withdrawing, the chair was taken by one of the Vice-Presidents, Professor A. C. Merriam.

20. Critical Miscellany [Eur. Suppl. 1049; Herod. viii. 124; Dinarch. c. Dem. 28, and c. Aristog. 15; Thuc. i. 50. 1, and ii. 37. 1; Plutarch. Vit. Lycurg. 13. 5; Xen. Anab. several passages], by E. G. Sihler, Ph. D., of New York, N. Y.

Eur. Supp. 1049, read ὑπερβᾶσ' ἦλυθες for the MSS. ὑπερβᾶσ' ἦλυθες.

Herodotus viii. 124, insert ἀνδραγαθίης, reading ἀριστήϊα μέν νυν ἔδοσαν ἀνδραγαθίης Εὐρυβιάδῃ ἐλαίης στέφανον

Dinarchus c. Dem. 28, μισθωτὸς οὗτος, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, μισθωτὸς οὗτός ἐστι: bracket second οὗτος. — c. Aristog. 15 read τοιοῦτον for the MSS. τοῖς τοῦτον: after ὃς ἀγαθὸν μὲν ὑμᾶς πεποίηκεν οὐδὲ πώποτε, add οὐδέν.

Thuc. i. 50. 1, read πρὸς δὲ τὸ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐτράποντο φονεύειν, inserting τό. — i. 37. 1, read ἧκειν for οἰκεῖν.

Plutarch Vit. Lyc. 13. 5, remove πόλλακις from its position before ἀμύνεσθαι, and let it precede ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς πολεμίους.

Xen. Anab. i. 1. 8, ὧν Τισσαφέρνους ἐτύγχανε defended. — i. 4. 15, bracket μόνοις πειθομένοις. — i. 5. 11, read τῶν τε Μένωνός του στρατιωτῶν, with Hertlein. — i. 8. 15, πελάσας of A B C to be preferred. — i. 8. 16, bracket Κλέαρχος. — ii. 6. 29, bracket στρατηγῶν. — iii. 2. 10, read παρὰ τοὺς ὅρκους λελύκασι. — iii. 2. 26, read τοὺς νῦν σκληρῶς ἐκεῖ βιοτεύοντας . . . πλουσίως ὁρᾶν. — iv. 4. 14, read ὑπὸ ἀτασθαλίας. — Following are believed to be original emendations: i. 9. 8, αἱ πόλεις αἱ ἐπιτρεπόμεναι. — i. 9. 10, ὅτι οὐκ ἄν ποτε φίλους προοῖτο. — i. 10. 10, ὥσπερ ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον. — iii. 2. 34, either ἀκούσαθ' ὧν προσδεῖν μοι δοκεῖ, or προσδεῖν δοκεῖ μοι. — iv. 6. 13, μένοιεν γὰρ ἂν αὐτοῦ.

21. On the Affinity of the Cheroki to the Iroquois Dialects, by Albert S. Gatschet, Esq., of the United States Bureau of Ethnology,

Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.: read by Professor C. R. Lanman, of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.

The Languages of the Cheroki and Iroquois related to each other.

To trace racial kinship through the affinity of language has always been a favorite mode of investigation with ethnologists. The proof of racial affinity hereby furnished is not absolutely sure and incontrovertible; but it is infinitely more safe than the one resting on similarity or identity of legal institutions, customs, or religious ideas, all of which are of a comparatively late origin. Frequently the linguistic material available is of a precarious quality, intensively and extensively, and this is the chief hindrance impeding progress in this line of research; for American languages, reliable dictionaries and grammars have come to hand in more recent times only.

A common origin for the Cheroki language and the numerous Iroquois dialects had been surmised by Dr. Barton as early as 1797 ("New Views," reprinted in 1798, with additions), and upheld by Albert Gallatin in his "Synopsis of the Indian Tribes" (in Archaeol. Americana, Vol. II. 1836); but none of these authors arrived at a final decision upon this problem. Barton also assumed genealogic connections between the most heterogeneous North American languages, and thus greatly weakened his arguments bearing upon the affinity of Cheroki and the languages of the Six Nations. The reason why he and the far-seeing, philosophic Gallatin did not come nearer the truth chiefly lay in the absurd and preposterous phonetic alphabet in which the majority of the vocabularies passing through their hands were worded. The mode of transcription used in them was the so-called "historic" English alphabet; homophonies are often produced by it where there are none in reality, and discrepancies obscuring the common origin of other terms. Neither was at that time any attention paid to the fact, that, in illiterate languages like those of the American natives, *one* and the same term may be *correctly* pronounced in six, ten, or twelve different ways, on account of the alternation or permutability of certain sounds, as we see it done in the Greek θάλασσα from ταράσσειν, or in Latin *meridies* for *medidies* (*medius dies*). For successfully comparing vocables belonging to different languages, it is extremely important to observe this phonetic law.

Mr. Horatio Hale was the first to establish on scientific principles the fact that Cheroki and Iroquois belong to the same linguistic family. In his article, "Indian Migrations as evidenced by Language" (Amer. Antiquarian, 1883, January, April, 27 pages), he established this connection, not on lexical data only,[1] but also, and more firmly, on grammatic grounds. Many more of both may be found out and brought to bear on the question by individuals fully conversant with one or several of the dialects involved. Gallatin states: "There is a similarity in the general termination of syllables, in the pronunciation and accent, which has struck some of the native Cherokees." Mr. Hale was enabled to arrive at his result only by possessing better and fuller information on both branches (especially on New York Iroquois and Huron) than that which had been previously published.

[1] Three words of his comparative list are adduced on sound resemblance only, not on real identity: *woman*, *boy*, *girl*.

With a view to examining the merits of Mr. Hale's article, the author of the present treatise set himself to comparing the collections of four Iroquois dialects, and of Cheroki verbal forms and vocables, made by himself with the aid of Indians, and to which he could implicitly trust concerning the important factor of *phonetics*. It will be well to remember that there are at present known to exist *four main branches* of Iroquois dialects, to be summarized in the following synopsis: —

A. *Huron*, formerly north of Lakes Ontario and Erie, and subdivided into (1.) the Tobacco Nation, Quatoghies, or Huron Proper, and (2.) the Wandót, who were in later times settled around Detroit, Mich., and Sandusky, Ohio, and lastly removed to Kansas and the Indian Territory, northeastern corner.

B. *Five Nations*, or *Iroquois Proper*, in Northwestern New York. The tribes extended from east to west in the following order: Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, and Senecas. All the Mohawk Indians have emigrated to Canada.

C. *Tuskaróra*, before 1720 or 1722 residing on Neuse and Tar Rivers, North Carolina, now near Buffalo, N. Y., and on the Brantford Reserve, Canada. A tribe affiliated to them were the Nottoways, in Southeastern Virginia.

D. *Cheroki*, with various sub-dialects, which are still spoken in their *old* homes, — the mountain tracts of Tennessee, North Carolina, and Georgia, — though five sixths of the people have emigrated over fifty years ago to the west of the Mississippi.

The collections made by the author comprise a few Iroquois dialects only, and are not very extensive; but they fully suffice to confirm and to amplify considerably the results laid down in Mr. Hale's article. Ten of the terms compared by Mr. Hale were incorporated into the list below, in which the abbreviations are as follows: —

C. Mohawk of Caughnawaga, near Montreal.
Cher. Eastern or Mountain Cheroki, N. C.
M. Mohawk of Brantford, Province of Ontario.
S. Seneca, State of New York.
T. Tuskaróra, or, as they abbreviate their tribal name, Skarúrĕ.
W. Wandót, commonly called Wéyandot, Indian Territory.

I now proceed to the enumeration of the lexical coincidences observed by me between Cheroki and the Iroquois dialects of the three branches (Huron, Iroquois Proper, Tuskaróra), after which is to follow a list of the phonetic and morphologic congruencies. The Cheroki word is placed at the head of the items throughout, before a semicolon. The terms are arranged after categories, as parts of the animal body, animals, plants, numerals, etc. In investigations of this kind grammatic affinity is of greater weight, however, than resemblances of words.

I. Lexical Affinity.

Cher. kanoχká, abbrev. kan'ká, 'tongue'; kanaχsáke, 'my tongue,' C. Cf. handá'hsha, 'tongue,' W.

kayáⁿsa, 'nose,' kayaⁿsóli, 'his nose'; huniû''sa, M.; 'niusa, C.

kanóge, 'arm'; kanäⁿshut, S. Cf. unûⁿdsha, M.

askó, uskó, 'head,' and ustié'hkai, 'his hair'; uskuára, 'hair,' W. Head and

hair are very frequently derived from the same radix in Indian and other languages: Latin *capillus*, from *capit-lus*, Greek κεφάλαιον.

ulasi'hténi, 'his foot'; u'hsítā, 'his foot,' M.

kanäká, 'skin' (of men, animals); gané'hm, C.

una'hwí, 'heart'; probably of the same origin as awéri, awéli, 'heart,' in M. and C. Compare, as to phonetics, Cher. únale, 'wind,' with owéra, howéra, 'wind,' in M.

ayelá^{n}-i, 'his body'; uyerû$^{'n}$ta, 'his body,' M.

akeyá^{n}like, 'old' and 'old person'; yukayú^{n}, 'old,' chiefly said of inanimate things, M.

ákskani, 'left,' 'on left side'; skenekuáti, C., 'skatkwadígwa, S.

katóχka, 'tail'; kataχsháki, C.

kanoskī'ski, 'thief'; hanä^{n}skuáha, 'thief,' W., kanû'ng'hskwa, 'to steal,' M.

yóna, 'bear'; anióyä^{n}, W. The French called the Mohawk Indians *Agniers*, after an Iroquois term for 'bear.'

á'hwi, 'deer,' á'hwi ékwa, 'elk,' viz. 'large deer'; ákwä, 'deer,' T.

ókana, 'ground-hog'; ukuntsisyúhi, or the 'white-faced,' W.

tsī'skwa, 'bird,' generic term; tsī't'ha, C.; tchítang'ha, M.

tíne, téne, 'louse'; utsínu, C.

tálu, 'oak'; ráru, 'white oak,' T.

úhiala, uhialúga, 'bark' (of plants); uyará, 'inner' or 'fibre bark,' W.

utsíla, 'flower,' utsilasá-i, 'flower,' when still on the plant; udsī'dsha, 'flower,' C.

ná^{n}ya, 'stone,' 'rock,' na^{n}yóhi, 'rocky'; onä'ya, 'stone,' M.

aguena^{n}sá-i, 'my home,' kanú^{n}sa, M., yenó^{n}sha, 'house,' W.; yanu'hshá-ä, 'lodge,' W. Occurs also in Cher. ganstá, ka^{n}stú, 'stick,' 'pole,' the Indian lodges being set up upon sticks.

kaní, gáni, 'arrow'; káno^{n}, S., and in kayä'^{n}kwire, C., gayû'^{n}kwire, M., 'arrow.' All these terms contain the radix or base *kan-* of the terms contained in the previous item ('house'), also of Cher. kanúnwa, 'pipe'; kanú^{n}nawa, 'tobacco-pipe,' M.

ŏ'ntsi, ü'^{n}tsi, 'snow'; óniete, C., unié'hte, M.

áma, amá, 'water,' amáyi, 'at, in the water'; áwĕ, 'water,' T.; amä'-iye, amáye, 'on the water,' W.

ónati, 'milk'; onû'ngua, S.

á^{n}tali, 'lake'; kaniátara, 'lake' and 'river,' 'expanse of water,' also 'ocean,' M.

talúkiski, 'iron,' 'tin'; *tal-* corresponds to *kal-* in kalíshtadsi, 'iron,' M. and C. Cf. kashtí, 'steel,' C.

atsíla, 'fire'; ŏ'dsile, ū'tsire C., ŏ'tchire M., utsī'shta W., 'fire.' The latter term appears in the Cher. udsī'stli kanŏ'ska, 'living coals' (kanŏ'ska, 'coal'), and utsola'hita, 'soot.'

ná^{n}to, 'sun,' 'moon'; núta in núta-uhä'ha, 'sunrise,' W. Probably also in yándisha, 'sun,' 'moon,' W.; and yátu in yátu-wats'hút'hu, 'sunset,' C.

galú^{n}lahi, galúnsa^{n}ti, 'sky,' 'on high'; karúnhia, M., C., tekaroniá^{n}te, 'sky,' W.

sunā'le, 'morning' and 'to-morrow'; cf. surawéye, 'in the forenoon,' W.

sanóyi, 'night'; usanhéya, 'evening.' Here *san-* corresponds to *sun-* in ashû'^{n}ta C., a'hsuntángne M., ewa'hsuntéye W., 'night.'

unéga-i, unéka, 'white'; undinié, W.

ékwa, 'large'; kówa, ko-u-ána, 'large,' 'great,' M. and other Iroq. dialects. The Cher. term occurs in Cher. ékwoni, 'river,' which stands for ékwoni áma, 'large water.'

sákwĕ, 'one' (*sa-* in the decades 11, 21, 31, etc.); 'nskă, M.

híski, 'five'; wíssk, u-isk, M. and other dialects.

The thoroughly *concrete* signification, and the large number of the terms compared, are a sufficient guarantee that they do not represent *words borrowed* from other languages, but that, in Cheroki as well as in Iroquois, they belong to the original, independent stock of vocables pertaining to one common linguistic family.

II. Affinity in Grammatic Elements.

Phonology. — The curious fact that the Iroquois dialects do not possess the sounds *b*, *p*, *v*, has already been observed by the earlier French missionaries. *F* is wanting also, for the *f* of Tuskaróra is not a real *f*, but should be written *w'h*; *m* appears only in a few dialects, and in Seneca it is difficult to distinguish it from *w* on hearing. Another labial, *w*, occurs in all dialects, and alternates with *u* and with a spirant commonly written *δ*, *8*, or *ω*; it also occurs in the Algónkin dialects. Nearly the *same* remarks may be made concerning the labials in Cheroki. *B*, *p*, and *v* do not exist; *f* is very rare, and adulterine also; but *w* is clearly distinguished from *m*. This aversion for labial sounds occurs nowhere east of Mississippi River, and forms a strong argument in favor of the affinity between Cheroki and the Iroquois dialects.

Morphology. — The verbal forms of the languages under discussion are so perplexing through their great number and variety, that for the present I have selected only a few for comparison, which mainly refer to nominal, not to verbal, inflection.

1. Terms designating the parts of the human and animal body show a prefix *ka-*, *ga-*, in both branches, which seems to represent a possessive prefix, — 'somebody's' (cf. 'tongue,' 'nose,' 'arm,' etc.). In the Iroquois dialects *u-*, *hu-* is sometimes found instead.

2. A Cheroki prefix *te-* forms the plural of certain nouns: tlúχka-i, 'tree,' pl. tetlúχka-i; kátusi, 'mountain,' pl. tekátusi. The same particle, *te-*, *de-*, serves to indicate that the action of the Cheroki transitive verb extends to more than one object:

galá-iha, 'I tie' one object; tegalá-iha, more than one object.
tsígia, 'I take' one object; tetsígia, detsígia, more than one object.

In Mohawk the suffixed syllable *-ti* forms the plural pronominal object in several combinations (Cuoq, Études Philologiques, p. 118):

sakoti, 'they them' ('they' masc.).
yakoti, 'they them' ('they' fem.).
ko^{n}wati, ro^{n}wati, 'one they' (French *on eux*).

In Cheroki we find *te- prefixed* in the same function: te-awka, 'he us'; te-gihya, 'thou them'; te-yawka, 'they us' (H. Hale, Antiq., 1883). The nominal dual in Mohawk, which originated from the numeral tékeni, 'two,' is perhaps of similar origin, but suffixes *-ke* at the end of the term: kanú^{n}sha, 'house'; tekanu^{n}sáke, 'two houses'; nikano^{n}sáke, 'houses.'

3. Cheroki, as well as Iroquois, possesses a personal conjugation for the dual in the transitive and in the intransitive verb. Herein they probably differ from all Indian tongues spoken east of Mississippi River, for the majority of North American languages possess a dual in the intransitive verb only, and only *one* form for all the three persons.

4. Add to the above the grammatic paradigm of 'I alone,' 'thou alone,' etc., and that of the combined subject- and object-pronouns given in Mr. Hale's article. Several of the dialectic changes relative to phonetics are also pointed out there.

At first sight Cheroki appears wholly distinct from Tuskaróra, Wandót, and the Iroquois dialects; but the more comparisons are made between them, the more their original kinship becomes apparent. The recognition of this common origin will have its effects in setting forth unexpected ethnologic connections between the Southern and Northern branches, which in historic times were always involved in mutual warfare, and seemed wholly bent on exterminating each other.

22. On Positions of the Larynx in Vowel Articulations, with Remarks concerning Bell's "Visible Speech," by Professor Samuel Porter, of the National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.

The larynx is so connected with the hyoid bone and the root of the tongue that its position must change with changes in the action and position of the tongue, and may thus be regarded as having no direct agency in vowel formation, but as related thereto only in a secondary and incidental way. Observations made in a few instances by the writer show a considerable want of uniformity as among different individuals, to be accounted for, doubtless, in part, by differences in the natural shape and structure of the organs, — the concavity of the palate, for instance, which varies greatly in different persons; besides the fact that the same vowel may be given by organic positions differing within certain limits.

In the majority of the cases examined, the larynx was drawn forward and depressed for the vowels *ee* (in *eel*) and *oo* (in *too*), and receded and rose higher for other vowels. In one individual with a nearly flat palate, the change in this direction, in passing from *ee* to the *a* in *ale*, and again from that to the *a* in *air*, was most strongly marked. The explanation is this. In each of these three vowels there is an approximation, or constriction, between tongue and palate, giving a resonant cavity behind and before, — the one behind to be regarded as the more important. Both the part of the tongue behind and the part before the place of constriction are lower for the *a* in *ale* than for *ee*, and the connecting channel shorter; and still more so for the *a* in *air*, or the French *è* in *père*. The root of the tongue is thus thrust backward, and the larynx is thereby forced back, and by the action of the hyoid bone drawn upward.

Reference was made in this connection to the views of Mr. Schnyder, opposed to those of Bell, and reported by Professor Whitney to the Association in 1884. The speaker proceeded to advocate the adoption of the Bell vowel scheme in its leading features, and with its nomenclature, as a suitable basis on which to build a perfect system. He adverted to the prominence and precedence given by Bell to tongue positions; the division of these into back, front, and mixed;

the subdivision into high, mid, and low; and the division of these again into the narrow (a term substituted by Mr. Sweet for the "primary" of Mr. Bell), and the wide; — also to the labial rounding regarded as a superimposed modification.

Correcting the errors of Mr. Bell as to the *a* vowel, we may have the old triangular arrangement; but with two lines on each side, one for the narrow and one for the wide, diverging from two varieties of the *a;* and with the mixed on a vertical, or bisecting, line, into which would fall the English *u* in *up* and *e* in *fern*, and the French *eu* and German *ö*. Professor Porter spoke also of the French *u* and German *ü* as differing from *i*, and *eu* and *ö* from *e*, not merely by labial rounding, but as related to them very much as the English *ŭ*, etc., are to the back vowels; — though this could not be well represented on the triangular diagram without adding an appendage that would mar the symmetry of the figure.

The Association adjourned to 2.30 P. M.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., Thursday, July 9, 1885.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The President called the Association to order at 2.30 P. M. A letter of thanks, from the New England Summer School of Hebrew, signed by Professors F. B. Denio and D. G. Lyon, and the Rev. S. H. Lee, as Committee, for the invitation to participate in the excursion of the preceding day, was laid before the Association.

The report of the Committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year was presented by Professor W. D. Whitney. In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, the officers for 1885–86 were elected as follows: —

President, Professor Tracy Peck, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Vice-Presidents, Professor A. C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.; Professor Isaac H. Hall, New York, N. Y.
Secretary, Professor John H. Wright, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Treasurer, Professor John H. Wright.

Additional members of the *Executive Committee*, —

Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Professor Charles R. Lanman, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Professor Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.
Professor Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio.
Professor William D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The report of the Committee on the next meeting of the Association was presented by Professor F. A. March. The Committee

recommended that the Association should meet at Ithaca, N. Y., on July 13, 1885, unless otherwise ordered by the Executive Committee.

The report was accepted, and the recommendations were adopted.

Professor Harkness reported, on behalf of the Auditing Committee, that the Treasurer's accounts had been examined and found correct. The report was accepted.

Professor March, as Chairman of the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling, presented the report.

The comittee has taken no action since the last report. The alfabetic list of words changed by the rules adopted in 1883, which it was hoped might be made by the comittee with the concurrence of the Philological Society of England, has not been completed. There has been no great activity among the frends of the reform in England. Reformers of spelling in Germany hav done better.

On motion the report was accepted, and the Committee appointed in 1875 was continued for another year. It now consists of Messrs. March (Chairman), W. F. Allen, Child, Lounsbury, Price, Trumbull, and Whitney.

23. A Comparison of Three Recensions of the Rāmāyaṇa, by Samuel B. Platner, Ph. D., of Newark, N. J.

Instead of one established text of the Indian epic, the Rāmāyaṇa, there are found several, each differing from the others to a greater or less extent. This state of things, quite unparalleled elsewhere, is as remarkable as it is perplexing to any one who attempts to study the text critically. These various forms of the poem, called Recensions, are found in various parts of India, and are each supported by manuscripts. In general these recensions agree in all the main points of the story, and correspond more often than they disagree in the divisions into chapters, etc.; but in the matter of words they differ very widely, while expressing often the same idea. There are also chapters in one recension which do not appear in the others, differences in the stories told, and in various points of mythology and nomenclature. Several causes, uniting to bring about this result, may be discovered. First, the Rāmāyaṇa after its completion by Vālmīki, was recited by bards, corresponding to the Greek Rhapsodists, throughout India, even after it had been reduced to writing. Any work orally current in this way is sure of being corrupted on account of the carelessness and forgetfulness of the bards. Secondly, these Rhapsodists would often feel inclined to add to or change some passage, as seemed best to themselves; and this result would be greatly facilitated by the enormous extent of the poem. The nature of its composition made the Rāmāyaṇa much harder to learn than the Iliad or Odyssey. A whole page of adjectives is often found, which could not possibly be preserved unchanged. In the third place, the great popularity which the Rāmāyaṇa achieved caused

the poem to become current over so large an extent of territory that this fact necessitated many important changes. This popularity was due, no doubt, in large measure, to the reward promised to every one who would read the poem through. The following verse is found in the first chapter: "Whoever reads this story of the doings of Rāma, which is pure and purifying, and equal to the Vedas, is released from all his sins." A fourth fact, which contributed to the gradual change of the poem, is that the manuscripts themselves were, in all probability, altered extensively by the learned men throughout India, who made changes continually to suit themselves. Naturally these changes varied in kind and amount, according to the various ideas current in different parts of the country. The intentional alterations far exceeded in number and importance those due to other causes.

There are now two, or possibly three distinct recensions, belonging to different parts of India. (1.) The Bengal Recension, so called from its existence in manuscripts written in Bengālī characters. This text has been given to the public in G. Gorresio's edition and Italian translation. Weber states that in the Berlin manuscripts of the Rāmāyaṇa he finds many parts in Devanāgarī characters, which correspond to Gorresio's text and lend it additional authority. (2.) The Northern Recension, which has been printed at Bombay, and goes by the name of the Bombay text. (3.) Schlegel's text of the first two books, another version of the Northern Recension, but by some called a separate recension.

The number of these recensions will very likely increase as new manuscripts shall be found, and the problem of discovering the original text will be made correspondingly difficult. The different styles of writing in various parts of the country, the different tastes and artistic ideas of different societies, all exhibit themselves in varying texts; and it is, as Weber remarks, quite wonderful that there is so much harmony and consistency as we actually find. The amount of resemblance between these three texts was first considered numerically. A number of chapters in the first book were picked out at random, compared word for word, and all the çlokas, lines, and Pādas which were exactly alike in all three texts noted down. Taking the very first chapter as an example, it is found that Schlegel's text has 95 çlokas, or stanzas of two lines, the Bombay edition 100, and Gorresio's 106. Of these, three çlokas are alike in all, or about 3%. Of equal lines there are 36, or 18%, and of equal Pādas, half-lines, there are 64, or 34%. Now comparing Schlegel's text with the Bombay and Gorresio's, separately, in the first case 30 çlokas which were alike were found, or 30%; 114 equal lines, or 58%; and 265 equal Pādas, or 68% of resemblance; while in Schlegel and Gorresio there are only 10 equal çlokas, 10%; 75 equal lines, 58%; and 201 equal Pādas, 50%. Considering Schlegel's text by itself, there were found only ten variations between it and both the others. Of these ten, nine were single words, while one extra line had been inserted. Following out this method through a number of chapters, it was found that, while the other relations varied considerably, the differences between Schlegel's text and both the others were very few and insignificant, and such as could be explained in almost every case as simple mistakes. This method of comparison shows that generally Schlegel's text is taken from the Bombay version, although sometimes it has more in common with Gorresio's text. Thus, in twelve chapters in the first book, on comparing Schlegel and the Bombay text together, it is found that 30% of the çlokas are

the same, 57% of single lines, and 69% of Pādas, while in Schlegel and Gorresio the corresponding percentages are 10, 29, and 41. In thirteen chapters compared thus numerically, only 1% of the whole number of çlokas were alike in all three texts, 10% of all the lines, and 26% of all the Pādas. The differences are seen to be quite considerable, and the tables of resemblances for separate chapters give very interesting results, owing to the great variations in the proportions. Besides the numerical relations, each Pāda was examined to see what results could be obtained, bearing upon the question as to the amount of authenticity which can be attributed to each recension in respect to priority in time and greater genuineness. It is perfectly plain that no one of the three recensions, as we know them, exhibits the true form of the original poem, and the only question is which is probably nearest to that original. The variations are frequently of a most tantalizing nature. It is impossible, in many cases, to say with any confidence whether a given difference is to be considered as intentional or accidental, when it might equally well be either. The whole matter seems often to resolve itself into a question of good guessing, in a manner quite exasperating. It is only the cumulative evidence, in such cases, which can be counted as having much weight, and fortunately there is plenty of such proof at hand.

As resulting from this examination of the three recensions, the following indications were mentioned, showing that the text of the Bombay edition had not been subjected to any critical revision, in the same manner as that of Gorresio's edition. (1.) The incompleteness of parts found in the Bombay text. By this it is meant, that a single idea or sentence is not limited to a natural and definite division of the verse, but frequently takes up some portion of another division. Thus it is found that new paragraphs, not closely connected with what precedes, begin at the second line of a çloka. This fact would not be so noticeable if it were not that Gorresio's text almost always avoids such usages. Even in the case of Pādas, Gorresio's text seems to attempt to make them as complete as possible in themselves. (2.) In the Bombay text çlokas occur with tolerable frequency, which contain six Pādas. No explanation of this fact was offered, but it was considered to be an evidence of crudeness and a lack of anything like revision. (3.) In the Bombay text chapters are found ending with single lines, instead of complete çlokas. This usage is of the same nature as the last, and to be considered in the same way. (4.) In the Bombay text we find changes in the number of verbs and nouns, made without regard to the demands of the context. Every inconsistency of this kind is carefully avoided in Gorresio. (5.) In the Bombay text are found inconsistencies in the use of tenses. Thus, futures and presents are used together, where propriety demands the use of one tense to the exclusion of the other. No place was found in Gorresio where an irregularity of this kind occurred. (6.) The Bombay edition is full of irregular and loose constructions, which are sometimes blind, and need Gorresio's text to make them clear. Then, there are many passages which, while not exactly loose or irregular, are greatly lacking in skill of construction, and suggest the style of the older language. In the grammatical usages are indications that the Bombay text is older than Gorresio's. There are more points of similarity with the older language, and much greater freedom in construction. Older words are used, which the Bengal revisers evidently thought it necessary to change into more familiar ones. (7.) In the Bombay text there occur unaugmented verb forms, of which usage no case has been discovered in Gorresio.

Thus, Bombay, I. 1. 59 çansat; I. 9. 6 samabhivartata; I. 66. 22 pīdyan, etc. (8.) In the Bombay text there occur irregularly formed gerunds, as I. 1. 65 utsmāyitvā; I. 1. 74 nivedayitvā; I. 1. 97 upāsitvā; I. 12. 22 visarjayitvā, etc. These are all carefully corrected in Gorresio. The case of tmesis found in Bombay I. 2. 29, *upa çiokam imam jagāu*, is probably unique, but nevertheless may be worth something in deciding upon the value of the different recensions. Such an anomalous construction as *gatānām teṣu vipreṣu*, Bombay I. 12. 22, would certainly not survive a revision.

This state of things indicates that Gorresio's text has been revised. It is supposed that the learned men in Bengal devoted more attention to the poem than it received elsewhere. *All* the indications of age and crudeness in the Bombay text are conspicuous by their absence from Gorresio. Often where in other respects a whole çloka is the same in both recensions, a single word will be changed to avoid some inconsistency, looseness, or irregularity, and this occurs so often that it is necessary to suppose intentional alteration. Besides the absence of all questionable expressions, Gorresio's text has the positive merit of greater artistic excellence, and more elegance in the combination of words. There is also a marked endeavor to make each passage as lucid as possible, and to avoid all abrupt and harsh transitions. This last fact accounts for many of the lines in Gorresio which do not occur in the Bombay text. The great increase in poetical grace will be evident to any one who will compare the two versions. There is, at the same time, more artificiality in Gorresio's verse than in the Bombay version, and a greater desire to produce striking effects. This is seen in the alliteration of the following line (Gorresio I. 1. 19):

sa satyaḥ sa samaḥ sāumyaḥ sa caika priyadarçanaḥ,

and in such compounds as Gorresio I. 1. 30:

rūpayāuvanamadhuryaçīlācarasamanvtiā;

of which usage there are other instances. Gorresio also uses the aorist in the sense of an imperfect with more frequency than the other texts. In only four chapters, seven aorists occur in Gorresio, which do not appear in the others. In the use of vocatives, frequency of which is a mark of early origin, Gorresio's text is much more sparing than the Bombay. The insertion of such chapters as the fourth of the first book in Gorresio, which is merely a table of contents, is additional proof of lateness.

With reference to Schlegel's text very little more needs to be śaid. It does not deserve to be called a separate recension, as it is plainly nothing but a composite, made up by combining readings from Bombay and Gorresio. As was seen in the chapters where all the variations between Schlegel and both the other texts were noted, these differences were insignificant. Now and then a line is found in this text which has no correspondent elsewhere, but even these are always unimportant, and prove no third recension. The conclusion is, that, while it is not to be supposed that we have the original Rāmāyaṇa in a perfectly pure form, the version contained in the Bombay edition is very much nearer the original than that of Gorresio, and that Schlegel's text, while elegant, is critically almost valueless.

The following papers were read by title: —

24. Ancient Tunnels,[1] by Professor A. C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.

This paper was especially devoted to a description of the ancient tunnel and aqueduct, built probably by Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, about 525 B. C., and described by Herodotus as one of the three wonders of the island. It was intended for the introduction of the water of a copious spring north of the city, from which it was separated by a mountain seven or eight hundred feet high. Through this mountain a tunnel about three quarters of a mile in length was run, with a height and breadth of eight feet. The position of this tunnel was unknown to modern scholars until 1882, when it was discovered by the abbot of a neighboring monastery, and he interested the authorities of the island in an attempt to clear it out for present use. This was not completely successful, but enough was done to show that the statements of Herodotus were correct, even to the channel which he says was dug below the tunnel itself. It seems that the engineer constructed his tunnel first, and on bringing the water down to it, discovered that he had begun his tunnel at too high a level, and he was compelled to dig a conduit below it, some ten feet deeper at the upper end and thirty at the lower, in order to get the water into the city. The tunnel was run from both ends, and when the two sections arrived at the point of junction they were several feet distant from each other, vertically as well as laterally. Still, with the means at their command in that day, the work was a great engineering feat. This aqueduct was compared with others on the continent of Greece, and especially with that at Jerusalem, between the Virgin's Pool and that of Siloam, recently re-examined by Lieut. Conder in the interest of the Palestine Exploration Fund. This conduit was far inferior to the Samian in size, and in the excellence of the work.

25. The Philosophy of Lucretius, by the Rev. Dr. C. K. Nelson, of Brookeville Academy, Brookeville, Md.

The recent publication of Professor F. W. Kelsey's Lucretius was made the occasion of presenting a few thoughts on the philosophy of the poet. After briefly reviewing this edition, the writer said that Lucretius owed much to the terseness, vigor, and majestic sweep of the tongue in which it was his privilege to compose. The errors in the popular conception of Lucretius were adverted to, and the views of Sellar, Farrar, De Quincey, Mrs. Browning, and J. A. Symonds were quoted. The writer held that the poet, in an age of fearful moral corruption and darkness, himself of a profoundly religious temper, turned to nature for light; that he was nearer the truth than was Socrates; that his pantheism and agnosticism were not such as would be inconsistent with revealed religion; that his earnestness and conscientiousness and his quickness of sympathy were almost Christian in their depth; that he should be called the poet of progress, instinct with the germs of scientific and philosophic truth. The paper closed with a brief notice of some of the literary features of the poem, and of the peculiarities of the language of the author.

[1] Printed in full in the School of Mines Quarterly, New York, 1885.

On motion a resolution was adopted in substance as follows: —

The American Philological Association desires to express its hearty thanks to the President and Fellows of Yale College, for the use of Sloane Laboratory for the meetings of the Association, and for the invitation to visit other buildings under their care; also to the resident members of the Association, and to other citizens of New Haven, by whose liberality the excursion of Wednesday, July 8, was made possible.

The Association adjourned at about 3.30 P. M.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1885-86.

PRESIDENT.

TRACY PECK.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

ISAAC H. HALL.

A. C. MERRIAM.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

JOHN H. WRIGHT.

TREASURER.

JOHN H. WRIGHT.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and —

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

FRANCIS A. MARCH.

BERNADOTTE PERRIN.

WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.[1]

J. W. Abernethy, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cyrus Adler, 870 North Eighth St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Eben Alexander, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
Frederic D. Allen, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece (Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.).
George Gillespie Allen, Boston, Mass.
William F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Robert Andersen, Episcopal Academy, 1314 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Conn.
N. L. Andrews, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Robert Arrowsmith, Racine College, Racine, Wis.
Sidney G. Ashmore, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
John Avery, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Grove E. Barber, State University, Lincoln, Nebraska.
E. H. Barlow, Tilden Seminary, West Lebanon, N.H.
George A. Bartlett, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
William M. Baskerville, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Isbon T. Beckwith, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
George Bendelari, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Charles E. Bennett, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. (511 North Sixteenth St.).
T. S. Bettens, "The Kensington," cor. Fifty-seventh St. and Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.
Louis Bevier, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
James S. Blackwell, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
E. W. Blyden, Monrovia College, Liberia.
James R. Boise, Morgan Park, Ill.
Charles E. Brandt, Farmington, Conn.

[1] This list has been corrected up to June 8, 1886. Names where the residence is left blank are of members who either are in Europe, or whose addresses are not known to the Secretary.

H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
Fisk P. Brewer, Grinnell, Iowa.
Walter Ray Bridgman, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Francis Brown, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Sylvester Burnham, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Henry F. Burton, Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (47 North Ave.).
Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
William H. Carpenter, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
W. B. Carr, Leesburgh, Loudoun Co., Va.
Franklin Carter, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Miss Eva Channing, Forest Hill St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Elie Charlier (Life Member), 108 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Francis J. Child, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Bradbury L. Cilley, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
Herbert M. Clarke, Syracuse, N. Y. (86 James St.).
Adolphe Cohn, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry A. Coit, S. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
William T. Colville, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.
Albert S. Cook, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Joseph Randolph Coolidge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Oscar H. Cooper.
Howard Crosby, New York, N. Y. (116 East Nineteenth St.).
John M. Cross, Kingston, N. Y.
James G. Croswell, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
W. S. Currell, Hampden-Sidney College, Va.
S. E. D. Currier, 2 Cedar St., Roxbury, Mass.
Schele De Vere, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
Miss C. T. Davis, Packer Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Francis B. Denio, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.
Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Louis Dyer, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Morton W. Easton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
T. T. Eaton, Louisville, Ky.
William Wells Eaton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Thomas H. Eckfeldt, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
August Hjalmar Edgren, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Arthur M. Elliott, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Alfred Emerson, Milford, Neb.
Charles E. Fay, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass.
O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Mrs. G. W. Field, 204 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Isaac Flagg, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
O. O. Fletcher, Ottawa, Ill.
John Forsyth, Newburgh, N. Y.
Harold N. Fowler, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Kuno Francke, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
W. G. Frost, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.
James M. Garnett, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
Henry Garst, Otterbein University, Westerville, Ohio.
Albert S. Gatschet, United States Bureau of Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.
Charles T. Gayley, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Frank M. Gilley, 27 Marlboro St., Chelsea, Mass.
Farley B. Goddard, Malden, Mass.
Thomas D. Goodell, High School, Hartford, Conn. (218 Main St.).
Ralph L. Goodrich, U. S. Courts, Little Rock, Ark.
William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Richard T. Greener, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James M. Gregory, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
F. B. Gummere, Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass.
Ephraim W. Gurney, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
William Gardner Hale, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum, Central Park, New York, N. Y.
Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
William R. Harper, Baptist Theological Seminary, Morgan Park, Ill.
Calvin S. Harrington, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
J. Rendell Harris, Cambridge, England.
Caskie Harrison, Brooklyn Latin School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Montague St.).
James A. Harrison, Washington and Lee Univ., Lexington, Va.
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
William H. Hawkes, 1330 New York Ave., Washington, D. C.
B. J. Hawthorne, State Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oregon.
Charles R. Hemphill, Louisville, Ky.
Theophilus Heness, 142 Crown St., New Haven, Conn.
Lucius Heritage, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
W. T. Hewett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Cambridge, Mass.
Newton B. Hobart, Western Reserve Academy, Hudson, Ohio.
George O. Holbrooke, Athens, Pa.
Edward W. Hopkins, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
E. R. Humphreys, 129 West Chester Park, Boston, Mass.
Milton W. Humphreys, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Ashley D. Hurt, State Agricultural College, Lake City, Fla.
Edmund Morris Hyde, Cheshire, Conn.
A. V. W. Jackson, Highland Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.
Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Frank E. Jennison.
Henry Johnson, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Henry C. Johnson, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.
John L. Johnson, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss.
John Norton Johnson, Bordentown, N. J.
Elisha Jones, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Robert P. Keep, Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.
Martin Kellogg, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
D. B. King, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Louis Kistler, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
George Lyman Kittredge, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
William I. Knapp, Yale College, New Haven, Conn. (75 Whitney Ave.).
Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lewis H. Lapham, 68 Gold St., New York, N. Y.
C. W. Larned, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.
R. F. Leighton, 109 Lefferts Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
John M. Leonard, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
William S. Liscomb, Providence, R. I.
Thomas R. Lounsbury, Yale College, New Haven, Conn. (22 Lincoln St.).
Miss Rebecca S. Lowrey, 162 West Forty-seventh St., New York, N. Y.
Jules Luquiens, Mass. Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
Frederick Lutz, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
David G. Lyon, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
James C. Mackenzie, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Irving J. Manatt, State University, Lincoln, Neb.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Francis A. March, Jr., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Winfred R. Martin, High School, Hartford, Conn.
Miss Ellen F. Mason, Newport, R. I.
R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
W. Gordon McCabe, University School, Petersburg, Va.
Irwin P. McCurdy, 723 South Twentieth St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
George F. McKibben, Denison University, Granville, O.
Miss Harriet E. McKinstry, Lake Erie Female Seminary, Painesville, O.
H. Z. McLain, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.
George McMillan, State University, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Charles M. Mead, Leipzig, Saxony.
John Meigs, Hill School, Pottstown, Pa.

Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. (124 East Fifty-fifth St.).
Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Henry A. Metcalf, Auburndale, Mass.
Charles R. Miller, Editor of *The New York Times*, New York, N. Y.
George F. Moore, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
*Charles D. Morris, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Wilfred H. Munro, De Veaux College, Suspension Bridge, N. Y.
Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
C. K. Nelson, Brookeville Academy, Brookeville, Md.
Marston Niles, 155 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
J. O. Notestein, University of Wooster, Ohio.
Charles P. Otis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
Arthur H. Palmer, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (750 Republic St.).
Charles P. Parker, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry E. Parker, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
E. G. Parsons, Derry, N. H.
Theodore C. Pease, Malden, Mass.
Ezra J. Peck.
Tracy Peck, Yale College, New Haven, Conn. (87 Wall St.).
William T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I. (350 Pine St.).
William R. Perkins, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio (837 Case Ave.).
Edward D. Perry, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
W. H. P. Phyfe, 12 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.
William T. Piper, Cambridge, Mass. (179 Brattle St.).
Samuel B. Platner, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
William C. Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (12 Barnes St.).
Louis Pollens, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.
L. S. Potwin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio (2108 Euclid Ave.).
John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.
Henry Preble, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
George Prentice, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Sylvester Primer, Charleston, S. C.
Louis Dwight Ray, 2125 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky.
Charles W. Reid, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

* Died February 7, 1886.

Charles F. Richardson, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Rufus B. Richardson, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Alfred L. Ripley, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Arthur W. Roberts, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa.
F. E. Rockwood, University at Lewisburg, Pa.
Lawrence Rust, Gambier, Ohio.
Julius Sachs, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Samuel G. Sanders, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.
Wesley C. Sawyer, Dresden, Saxony.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio.
Henry Schliemann, Athens, Greece.
C. P. G. Scott, 69 Wall St., New York, N. Y.
Walter Q. Scott, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
Jotham B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.
Thomas D. Seymour, Yale College, New Haven, Conn. (112 College St.).
Charles C. Shackford, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Robert Sharp, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
Joseph Alden Shaw, Trinity School, Tivoli-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
L. A. Sherman, State University, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Charles Short, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Edgar S. Shumway, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
E. G. Sihler, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Benjamin E. Smith, Century Co., Union Sq., New York, N. Y.
Charles Forster Smith, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Clement Lawrence Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Frank Webster Smith, State Normal School, Westfield, Mass.
Josiah R. Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
Edward Snyder, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
George C. S. Southworth, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.
Wm. G. Spencer, Fort Collins, Colo.
Edward H. Spieker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
A. B. Stark, Logan Female College, Russellville, Ky.
Frederick Stengel, School of Mines, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
J. R. S. Sterrett, Athens, Greece.
William A. Stevens, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
Austin Stickney, 35 West Seventeenth St., New York, N. Y.
Morris H. Stratton, State Board of Education, Salem, New Jersey.
Charles W. Super, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Frank B. Tarbell, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Franklin Taylor, High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (629 North Twelfth St.).
John Tetlow, Girls' High School, Boston, Mass.
J. Henry Thayer, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (67 Sparks St.).

Calvin Thomas, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
William E. Thompson, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.
Ambrose Tighe.
Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred Centre, N. Y.
E. T. Tomlinson, Rutgers College Grammar School, New Brunswick, N. J.
Crawford H. Toy, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James A. Towle, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin.
William H. Treadwell, Portsmouth, N. H.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.
Francis W. Tustin, University at Lewisburgh, Pa.
James C. Van Benschoten, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Addison Van Name, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
William Hayes Ward, Editor of *The Independent*, New York, N. Y.
Benjamin B. Warfield, Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.
Henry C. Warren, 67 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
William E. Waters, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
R. F. Weidner, Rock Island, Illinois.
D. M. Welton, McAllister Hall, Toronto, Canada.
Benjamin W. Wells, Friends' School, Providence, R. I.
J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Standfordville, N. Y.
A. S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn.
Benjamin I. Wheeler, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James R. Wheeler.
John H. Wheeler, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
Horatio Stevens White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
William Dwight Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
W. H. Whitsitt, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
R. H. Willis, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
Henry Wood, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Henry P. Wright, Yale College, New Haven, Conn. (128 York St.).
John Henry Wright, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

[Number of Members, 279.]

THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS (ALPHABETIZED BY TOWN) SUBSCRIBE FOR THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Albany, N. Y. : N. Y. State Library.
Amherst, Mass. : Amherst College Library.
Andover, Mass. : Phillips Academy.
Andover, Mass. : Theological Seminary.
Ann Arbor, Mich. : Michigan University.
Athens, Greece : American School of Classical Studies.
Austin, Texas : University of Texas.
Baltimore, Md. : Johns Hopkins University.
Baltimore, Md. : Peabody Institute.
Berea, Madison Co., Ky. : Berea College.
Berkeley, Cal. : University of California.
Boston, Mass. : Boston Athenæum.
Boston, Mass. : Boston Public Library.
Brooklyn, N. Y. : The Brooklyn Library.
Brunswick, Maine : Bowdoin College Library.
Buffalo, N. Y. : Young Men's Library.
Burlington, Vt. : University of Vermont.
Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard College Library.
Champaign, Ill. : University of Illinois.
Chicago, Ill. : Public Library.
Cleveland, O. : Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.
College Hill, Mass. : Tufts College Library.
Crawfordsville, Ind. : Wabash College Library.
Davidson, N. C. : Davidson College Library.
Easton, Pa. : Lafayette College Library.
Evanston, Ill. : Northwestern University.
Geneva, N. Y. : Hobart College Library.
Greencastle, Ind. : De Pauw University.
Hanover, N. H. : Dartmouth College Library.
Iowa City, Iowa : State University of Iowa.
Ithaca, N. Y. : Cornell University.
Lincoln, Neb. : State University of Nebraska.
Marietta, O. : Marietta College Library.
Middletown, Conn. : Wesleyan University.
Milwaukee, Wis. : Public Library.
Nashville, Tenn. : Vanderbilt University.
Newton Centre, Mass. : Newton Theological Institution.
New York, N. Y. : Astor Library.
New York, N. Y. : The College of the City of New York. (Lexington Ave. and 23d St.)

New York, N. Y.: Union Theological Seminary. (1200 Park Ave.)
Olivet, Eaton Co., Mich.: Olivet College Library.
Philadelphia, Pa.: American Philosophical Society.
Philadelphia, Pa.: The Library Company of Philadelphia.
Philadelphia, Pa.: The Mercantile Library.
Providence, R. I.: Brown University.
Providence, R. I.: Providence Athenæum.
Rochester, N. Y.: Library of Rochester University.
Sewanee, Tenn.: University of the South.
Springfield, Mass.: City Library.
Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama.
University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.: University Library.
Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress.
Washington, D. C.: United States Bureau of Education.
Waterville, Maine: Colby University.
Wellesley, Mass.: Wellesley College Library.
Windsor, Nova Scotia: King's College Library.
Worcester, Mass.: Free Public Library.

[Number of subscribing Institutions, 57.]

TO THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS HAVE BEEN SENT COMPLETE SETS (VOLUMES I. — XV.) OF THE TRANSACTIONS, GRATIS.

British Museum, London, England.
Royal Asiatic Society, London.
Philological Society, London.
Society of Biblical Archæology, London.
India Office Library, London.
Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Scotland.
Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland.
Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Shanghai.
Japan Asiatic Society, Yokohama.
Public Library of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia.
Sir George Grey's Library, Cape Town, Africa.
Reykjavik College Library, Iceland.
University of Christiania, Norway.
University of Upsala, Sweden.
Russian Imperial Academy, St. Petersburg.
Austrian Imperial Academy, Vienna.

Anthropologische Gesellschaft, Vienna.
Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, Italy.
Reale Accademia delle Scienze, Turin.
Société Asiatique, Paris, France.
Athénée Oriental, Paris.
Curatorium of the University, Leyden, Holland.
Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia, Java.
Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin, Germany.
Royal Saxon Society of Sciences, Leipzig.
Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.
Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Halle.
Library of the University of Bonn.
Library of the University of Jena.
Library of the University of Königsberg.
Library of the University of Leipzig.
Library of the University of Tübingen.

[Number of foreign Institutions, 35.]

[Total, (279 + 57 + 35 =) 371.]

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

Article I. — Name and Object.

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."

2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

Article II. — Officers.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.

2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.

3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

Article III. — Meetings.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.

2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.

3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.

4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

ARTICLE IV. — MEMBERS.

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.

2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.

3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V. — SUNDRIES.

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.

2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VI. — AMENDMENTS.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE annually published "Proceedings" of the American Philological Association contain an account of the doings at the annual meeting, brief abstracts of the papers read, reports upon the progress of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published "Transactions" give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decide to publish. The Proceedings are bound with them as an Appendix.

The following tables show the authors and contents of the first sixteen volumes of Transactions:

1869-1870. — Volume I.

Hadley, J.: On the nature and theory of the Greek accent.

Whitney, W. D.: On the nature and designation of the accent in Sanskrit.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the aorist subjunctive and future indicative with ὅπως and οὐ μή.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the best method of studying the North American languages.

Haldeman, S. S.: On the German vernacular of Pennsylvania.

Whitney, W. D.: On the present condition of the question as to the origin of language.

Lounsbury, T. R.: On certain forms of the English verb which were used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On some mistaken notions of Algonkin grammar, and on mistranslations of words from Eliot's Bible, etc.

VanName, A.: Contributions to Creole grammar.

Proceedings of the preliminary meeting (New York, 1868), of the first annual session (Poughkeepsie, 1869), and of the second annual session (Rochester, 1870).

1871. — Volume II.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Allen, F. D.: On the so-called Attic second declension.

Whitney, W. D.: Strictures on the views of August Schleicher respecting the nature of language and kindred subjects.

Hadley, J.: On English vowel quantity in the thirteenth century and in the nineteenth.

March, F. A.: Anglo-Saxon and Early English pronunciation.

Bristed, C. A.: Some notes on Ellis's Early English Pronunciation.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On Algonkin names for man.

Greenough, J. B.: On some forms of conditional sentences in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit.

Proceedings of the third annual session, New Haven, 1871.

1872. — Volume III.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: Words derived from Indian languages of North America.

Hadley, J.: On the Byzantine Greek pronunciation of the tenth century, as illustrated by a manuscript in the Bodleian Library.

Stevens, W. A.: On the substantive use of the Greek participle.

Bristed, C. A.: Erroneous and doubtful uses of the word *such*.

Hartt, C. F.: Notes on the Lingoa Geral, or Modern Tupí of the Amazonas.

Whitney, W. D.: On material and form in language.

March, F. A.: Is there an Anglo-Saxon language?

March, F. A.: On some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: Notes on forty versions of the Lord's Prayer in Algonkin languages.

Proceedings of the fourth annual session, Providence, 1872.

1873. — Volume IV.

Allen, F. D.: The Epic forms of verbs in *άω*.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Hadley, J.: On Koch's treatment of the Celtic element in English.

Haldeman, S. S.: On the pronunciation of Latin, as presented in several recent grammars.

Packard, L. R.: On some points in the life of Thucydides.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the classification of conditional sentences in Greek syntax.

March, F. A.: Recent discussions of Grimm's law.

Lull, E. P.: Vocabulary of the language of the Indians of San Blas and Caledonia Bay, Darien.

Proceedings of the fifth annual session, Easton, 1873.

1874. — Volume V.

Tyler, W. S.: On the prepositions in the Homeric poems.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On an English vowel-mutation, present in *cag*, *keg*.

Packard, L. R.: On a passage in Homer's Odyssey (x. 81–86).

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On numerals in American Indian languages, and the Indian mode of counting.

Sewall, J. B.: On the distinction between the subjunctive and optative modes in Greek conditional sentences.

Morris, C. D.: On the age of Xenophon at the time of the Anabasis.
Whitney, W. D.: Φύσει or θέσει — natural or conventional?

Proceedings of the sixth annual session, Hartford, 1874.

1875.—Volume VI.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.
Haldeman, S. S.: On an English consonant-mutation, present in *proof, prove*.
Carter, F.: On Begemann's views as to the weak preterit of the Germanic verbs.
Morris, C. D.: On some forms of Greek conditional sentences.
Williams, A.: On verb-reduplication as a means of expressing completed action.
Sherman, L. A.: A grammatical analysis of the Old English poem "The Owl and the Nightingale."

Proceedings of the seventh annual session, Newport, 1875.

1876.—Volume VII.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: On εἰ with the future indicative and ἐάν with the subjunctive in the tragic poets.
Packard, L. R.: On Grote's theory of the structure of the Iliad.
Humphreys, M. W.: On negative commands in Greek.
Toy, C. H.: On Hebrew verb-etymology.
Whitney, W. D.: A botanico-philological problem.
Goodwin, W. W.: On *shall* and *should* in protasis, and their Greek equivalents.
Humphreys, M. W.: On certain influences of accent in Latin iambic trimeters.
Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the Algonkin verb.
Haldeman, S. S.: On a supposed mutation between *l* and *u*.

Proceedings of the eighth annual session, New York, 1876.

1877.—Volume VIII.

Packard, L. R.: Notes on certain passages in the Phaedo and the Gorgias of Plato.
Toy, C. H.: On the nominal basis of the Hebrew verb.
Allen, F. D.: On a certain apparently pleonastic use of ὡς.
Whitney, W. D.: On the relation of surd and sonant.
Holden, E. S.: On the vocabularies of children under two years of age.
Goodwin, W. W.: On the text and interpretation of certain passages in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus.
Stickney, A.: On the single case-form in Italian.
Carter, F.: On Willmann's theory of the authorship of the Nibelungenlied.
Sihler, E. G.: On Herodotus's and Aeschylus's accounts of the battle of Salamis.
Whitney, W. D.: On the principle of economy as a phonetic force.
Carter, F.: On the Kürenberg hypothesis.
March, F. A.: On dissimilated gemination.

Proceedings of the ninth annual session, Baltimore, 1877.

1878. — Volume IX.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: Contributions to the history of the articular infinitive.
Toy, C. H.: The Yoruban language.
Humphreys, M. W.: Influence of accent in Latin dactylic hexameters.
Sachs, J.: Observations on Plato's Cratylus.
Seymour, T. D.: On the composition of the Cynegeticus of Xenophon.
Humphreys, M. W.: Elision, especially in Greek.

Proceedings of the tenth annual session, Saratoga, 1878.

1879. — Volume X.

Toy, C. H.: Modal development of the Semitic verb.
Humphreys, M. W.: On the nature of cæsura.
Humphreys, M. W.: On certain effects of elision.
Cook, A. S.: Studies in the Heliand.
Harkness, A.: On the development of the Latin subjunctive in principal clauses.
D'Ooge, M. L.: The original recension of the De Corona.
Peck, T.: The authorship of the Dialogus de Oratoribus.
Seymour, T. D.: On the date of the Prometheus of Aeschylus.

Proceedings of the eleventh annual session, Newport, 1879.

1880. — Volume XI.

Humphreys, M. W.: A contribution to infantile linguistic.
Toy, C. H.: The Hebrew verb-termination *un*.
Packard, L. R.: The beginning of a written literature in Greece.
Hall, I. H.: The declension of the definite article in the Cypriote inscriptions.
Sachs, J.: Observations on Lucian.
Sihler, E. G.: Virgil and Plato.
Allen, W. F.: The battle of Mons Graupius.
Whitney, W. D.: On inconsistency in views of language.
Edgren, A. H.: The kindred Germanic words of German and English, exhibited with reference to their consonant relations.

Proceedings of the twelfth annual session, Philadelphia, 1880.

1881. — Volume XII.

Whitney, W. D.: On Mixture in Language.
Toy, C. H.: The home of the primitive Semitic race.
March, F. A.: Report of the committee on the reform of English spelling.
Wells, B. W.: History of the *a*-vowel, from Old Germanic to Modern English.
Seymour, T. D.: The use of the aorist participle in Greek.
Sihler, E. G.: The use of abstract verbal nouns in -σις in Thucydides.

Proceedings of the thirteenth annual session, Cleveland, 1881.

1882. — Volume XIII.

Hall, I. H.: The Greek New Testament as published in America.
Merriam, A. C.: Alien intrusion between article and noun in Greek.
Peck, T.: Notes on Latin quantity.
Owen, W. B.: Influence of the Latin syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.
Wells, B. W.: The Ablaut in English.
Whitney, W. D.: General considerations on the Indo-European case-system.

Proceedings of the fourteenth annual session, Cambridge, 1882.

1883. — Volume XIV.

Merriam, A. C.: The Caesareum and the worship of Augustus at Alexandria.
Whitney, W. D.: The varieties of predication.
Smith, C. F.: On Southernisms.
Wells, B. W.: The development of the Ablaut in Germanic.

Proceedings of the fifteenth annual session, Middletown, 1883.

1884. — Volume XV.

Goodell, T. D.: On the use of the Genitive in Sophokles.
Tarbell, F. B.: Greek ideas as to the effect of burial on the future life of the soul.
Perrin, B.: The Crastinus episode at Palaepharsalus.
Peck, T.: Alliteration in Latin.
Von Jagemann, H. C. G.: Norman words in English.
Wells, B. W.: The Ablaut in High German.
Whitney, W. D.: Primary and Secondary Suffixes of Derivation and their exchanges.
Warren, M.: On Latin Glossaries. Codex Sangallensis, No. 912.

Proceedings of the sixteenth annual session, Hanover, 1884.

1885. — Volume XVI.

(*In Press.*)

Easton, M. W.: The genealogy of words.
Goodell, T. D.: Quantity in English verse.
Goodwin, W. W.: Value of the Attic talent in modern money.
" " Relation of the Πρόεδροι to the Πρυτάνεις in the Attic Βουλή.
Perrin, B.: Equestrianism in the Doloneia.
Richardson, R. B.: The appeal to sight in Greek tragedy.
Seymour, T. D.: The feminine caesura in Homer.
Sihler, E. G.: A study of Dinarchus.
Wells, B. W.: The vowels *e* and *i* in English.
Whitney, W. D.: The roots of the Sanskrit language.

Proceeedings of the seventeenth annual session, New Haven, 1885.

The Proceedings of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application until they are out of print.

Separate copies of articles printed in the Transactions are given to the authors for distribution.

The "Transactions *for*" any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state — not the year of publication, but rather — the year *for* which the Transactions are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table:

The Transactions	for	1869	*and*	1870	form	Volume I.
"	"	"		1871	form	Volume II.
"	"	"		1872	"	" III.
"	"	"		1873	"	" IV.
"	"	"		1874	"	" V.
"	"	"		1875	"	" VI.
"	"	"		1876	"	" VII.
"	"	"		1877	"	" VIII.
"	"	"		1878	"	" IX.
"	"	"		1879	"	" X.
"	"	"		1880	"	" XI.
"	"	"		1881	"	" XII.
"	"	"		1882	"	" XIII.
"	"	"		1883	"	" XIV.
"	"	"		1884	"	" XV.
"	"	"		1885	"	" XVI.

The price of these volumes is $1.50 apiece, except Volume XV., for which $2.50 is charged. No reduction is made on orders for less than nine volumes. The first two volumes will not be sold separately.

REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF COMPLETE SETS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

Single COMPLETE SETS of the Transactions (Volumes I.–XV.) will be sold to public libraries, until further notice, at *twenty* dollars a set.

It is especially appropriate that *American* Libraries should exert themselves to procure this series while it may be had. It is the work of *American* scholars, and contains many valuable articles not elsewhere accessible; and, aside from these facts, as the first collection of essays in general philology made in this country, it is sure to be permanently valuable for the history of American scholarship.